DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 069 SO 008 111

AUTHOR Townley, Charles, Ed.
TITLE Anthropology for the Classroom. The Social Science Teacher; Volume 3 Number 1, 1973.
INSTITUTION Association for the Teaching of the Social Sciences (England).
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 78p.; Based on a conference held at Bedford College (London, England, April 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Certification; *Comparative Education; Conference Reports; Course Objectives; Cross Cultural Studies; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnology; Human Geography; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Moral Development; Resource Materials; *Social Sciences; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Great Britain

ABSTRACT

This report of a conference attended by teachers and anthropologists concerns itself with the desirability and practicalities of teaching anthropology at the elementary and secondary levels in Britain. The papers reflect the varied objectives of a group trying to introduce a new element into school curricula. The president of the Royal Anthropological Institute states the case against teaching anthropology earlier than university level. The rebuttal to this opinion argues that students need to know of alternative cultural modes as they make life-time choices. Four papers discuss the contribution that anthropology makes to the studies of politics, geography, economics, and sex education. Another paper illustrates the use of songs as a medium for anthropological and sociological instruction. Two papers representing a "critique of anthropology" discuss the qualities of anthropology that distinguish it from the other social sciences. A study group on teaching anthropology, after hearing from several people already doing so, present some objectives and guides for anthropology instruction. Study groups considering curriculum content for those studying for the Certificate of Secondary Education and for the "O" level exams for university entrance present outlines of important concepts and applicable books in anthropology. Finally, the Teaching Resource Project of the Royal Anthropological Institute is described. (JH)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Social Science Teacher

1973

VOLUME 3 NUMBER 1

Editor CHARLES TOWNLEY

ED102069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Anthropology for the Classroom

BASED ON THE CONFERENCE HELD AT BEDFORD COLLEGE, LONDON

APRIL 1973

SO 008 111

published by the Association for the Teaching of the Social Sciences and printed by J. Brewer and Son, Peter Street, Chorley, Lancashire.

2/3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

EDMUND LEACH — Anthropology in the Classroom

RONALD FRANKENBERG — Anthropology Today

SUSANNE WOOD — Anthropology and Politics

RICHARD JOBY — Anthropology and Geography

DAVID SEDDON — Anthropology and Economics

EDITH KING — Using Music to Present Concepts in Anthropology and Sociology

GROUP REPORTS :

Critique of Anthropology, David Seddon

Critique of Anthropology, R. R. Clark

Study Group 'A', Teaching Anthropology

Anthropology at Great Baddow Comprehensive School, D. Olding

Anthropology Syllabus C.S.E. Mode 3

C.S.E. Group

O Level Group

Anthropology and Sex Education

R.A.I. TEACHING RESOURCES PROJECT

EDITORIAL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Increasingly rapid social change and the knowledge explosion have had important consequences on education. In particular they have led to a wider and more diversified curriculum. New subjects (and many already established elsewhere) demand places on the time-table until there is no longer any hope of accommodating them all in a conventional manner.

There is more than one solution. One, which tends to place a priority on knowledge and endeavours to be comprehensive, involves the six-day time table — when it is no longer a sign of approaching retirement to ask, What day is it, today? Others, which tend to emphasize skills and may be characterised by student choice, move inexorably towards a process-oriented curriculum.

The increasing popularity of the Social Sciences in higher education has been followed by their introduction in schools. Economics, Government, Psychology and Sociology are examined as disciplines in their own right and all are used as contributory sources in projects, 'integration' and inter-disciplinary enquiry. Anthropology can legitimately stake a claim in the former category and, already, is widely used in the latter.

Chris Brown, the Conference Organiser, highlighted the significance of Anthropology for teachers, in the Conference brochure, by quoting from 'Teaching as a Subversive Activity' by Postman and Weingartner (Penguin, 1971, p.17):

"We are talking about the schools cultivating in the young that most 'subversive' intellectual instrument — the anthropological perspective. This perspective allows one to be part of his own culture and, at the same time, to be out of it. One views the activities of his own group as would an anthropologist, observing its tribal rituals, its fears, its conceits, its ethnocentrism. In this way, one is able to recognise when reality begins to drift too far away from the grasp of the tribe."

If these ideas are accepted, clearly, Anthropology has a special role for the social science teacher.

The papers which follow discuss the desirability and practicalities of this role.

Professor Leach, whom we thank for permission to reproduce his paper, clearly is sceptical while Professor Frankenberg largely disagrees with him. The relationship between Anthropology, and the related disciplines of Politics, Economics and Geography are discussed and followed by the deliberations of the Critique of Anthropology group.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The subsequent papers are more concerned with the 'what' and 'how' questions. Professor King indicates one piece of her own work with young children in the United States. The reports of the study groups include some very useful resources, including a C.S.E. Mode 3 syllabus, examination papers and mark scheme, for which we are indebted to Mr. D. Olding of Great Baddow Comprehensive School, Chelmsford, and a set of resources and methods from John Clammer, of the University of Hull. Ann Hurman's paper indicates a resources folder which should be invaluable to teachers entering this field for the first time as well as to those already working in it.

As a result of this Conference the Association has now established close links with the Royal Anthropological Institute. Professional anthropologists and teachers alike look forward with confidence and enthusiasm to the opportunities and prospects which face us.

The Bedford College Conference marks an important stage in the history of social science teaching in this country.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

Edmund Leach*

Reproduced from The Times Educational Supplement by permission

"In its essence, my kind of social anthropolcgy is the comparative study of varieties of human social or organisation. The educational value of such study is that it shows that many things that we are inclined to take for granted, because they happen to be customary in our own way of life, might be managed quite differently. Such a demonstration ought to lead to self-criticism. Why should we think that such and such a manner of behaving is right and proper rather than something quite different?

It is surely obvious that school teachers should be encouraged to ask themselves questions of this sort, but whether their pupils ought to be subjected to the same kinds of doubt may be rather a moot point. It could be very confusing to learn about other people's moral values before you have confident understanding of your own."

This excerpt from Edmund Leach's remarks to the group of teachers gathered to discuss the inclusion of anthropology in the school curriculum states the argument that is amplified in the paper.

Professor Leach is Provost of King's College, Cambridge, and President of the Royal Anthropological Institute.

Pages 3-13 were removed from this document prior to its being submitted to the ERIC document reproduction service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY

Ronald Frankenberg *

I do not think it is possible to write on this subject, in this context, in an academic and theoretical way. My remarks are related directly to the situation as I see it concerning the teaching of Anthropology in schools. They also relate directly, or perhaps inversely, to the lecture by Edmund Leach with which I disagree. This is perhaps less drastic in that I believe that truth and enlightenment emerge from conflict.

There are two views about definitions. The school view that you start your essay with one; and the university view that essays end in definitions. Here I am going to compromise between the two and seek to distinguish anthropology from say, sociology, history, or psychology not by formal definition but in practice, by looking at two topics — football and science — and asking what questions different scientists ask about them.

It is possible to look at football from an historical point of view and to put it in the context of the development of ball games within society, to relate it to the development of leisure at particular periods and to the development of industry. One could then look at how the rules of football had changed internally and seek to relate these changes to external factors or to particular personalities in key positions. This is the approach of the historian. Eric Dunning of Leicester University, although a lecturer in sociology, has adopted such an analytical historical approach. Geoffrey Green and others have adopted more descriptive historical approaches.

Psychologists, too, have approached football in different ways. John Cohen, Professor of Psychology at Manchester, once, as part of a general study of the relationship between what people think they can do and what they can actually do, studied the behaviour of Manchester United forward Bobby Charlton. He asked Charlton to estimate his chances of scoring at varying distances from the goal and compared aspiration with achievement. The experiment was abandoned (it was rumoured at the personal intervention of Max Gluckman, an anthropologist) when it appeared to be the case that Charlton's goal scoring abilities were being adversely affected. He stopped to think and lost the ball. This is a psychological approach in terms of individual performance; other psychologists might interpret or analyse football in terms of deep needs.

If I might digress to tenpin bowling, I was once asked to evaluate its future and after a period of study argued that bowling alleys had a glorious future. My argument was that these establishments catered for all stages in the family life cycle — pop drinks and pop music for teenagers, alcohol for the aged, and good healthy competitive exercise

* Ronald Frankenberg is Professor of Sociology at the University of Keele

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for the health-conscious middle aged. I was wrong perhaps because, as an anthropologist, I over emphasised familial desires for togetherness. A psychoanalytical colleague told me that a game in which male symbols were knocked down by female symbols could never succeed. An economist looking at the same situation pointed out that the average family budget would not stand the high cost of such an evening out.

Sociologists concerned with football would immediately wish to discover the distribution by age, sex and social class, ethnic origin and religion of those who played, watched or organised and in no time at all would produce a set of punched cards ready to feed through the computer and produce tabulations.

It is true that some sociologists, perhaps ashamed to learn from anthropology, now pursue the same aims and methods as anthropologists but justify themselves by reference to the philosophers, Schutz, Husserl and Heidegger. As an anthropologist doing fieldwork in Britain I set out to study kinship and the effect on family life of village unemployment. Football was forced upon my attention because the people whose social life I meant to study felt that it was important. I saw football in terms of the kind of social processes involved in its organisation at local level; its implication for other social process; its relation to other cultural forms in the village.

Let me now turn to my other example — science. The historian looks at the way in which science developed in Europe and let us say in China. He tries to relate what was happening in science to a particular epoch of history. He asks what is happening in the arts and to the economy at the same time. He tries to discover and analyse the position in society of great scientists; their origin and their relationships to others. The psychologist is concerned with looking at individual scientists and perhaps asking what are the processes of thought which enable (or seem to enable) one person to draw conclusions from an experiment and another person not to be able to do so.

The sociologist in this field draws up indices, some of them quite fascinating. There is, for example, a nice distinction made between hard and soft science. Hard scientists write papers rather than books; their references are less than five years old; they get Ph.D's and then don't teach. The half-life of their papers is very short. Sociologists then discover attributes of different kinds of scientists; then they classify and count.

Anthropologists have in the past looked mainly at non-western science — and there is a growing interest in this field especially in the United States and especially in relation to medicine. But one or two have looked at western science, with perhaps odd results.

At one time, for example, I was interested in the distribution of cake at teatime in scientific departments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I discovered that in one particular scientific department, whenever anyone published a paper, they bought a cake for tea for their colleagues. Now this to a sociologist or historian seems a terribly trivial thing, hardly worth wasting your time on. But to an anthropologist it is something which is potentially very important and indeed so it proved. It suggests a whole series of processes of social control which might be operating. First of all, the scientist who has published the paper has to decide whether to buy a cake or not. If he fails to buy the cake it may be an indication of a number of things, for example, that he does not regard an article in **New Scientist** as a publication. Or that he does not regard a letter elsewhere as a publication but a letter in **Nature** is important. It may be that he feels that his colleagues have not been sufficiently helpful to him and so he withholds the cake. His colleagues may refuse to eat the cake because they consider that he has stolen the material in his article from somewhere else. It is incidentally a curious paradox in the minds even of some anthropologists that they regard the trivial customs of other societies as important but the trivial customs of their own as unimportant.

What I am trying to show is that the anthropologist has picked on something the relevance of which is not necessarily defined as such by the people involved, but which is something which happens. Just as in the same way Freud suggested that when people do things there was usually a dark and dismal reason behind it so the anthropologist cannot presume anything that happens is trivial.

I have rather laboured these two examples of science and football because I wanted to give, as it were, some ethnography from which one could form one's own kind of definitions of how anthropology differs from other subjects. Because it seems to me that, if one wishes rationally to discuss the role anthropology might have in the school, we need to see it in contradiction with other subjects like history, psychology and sociology. I would wish to see anthropology in diminishing contradiction with history and sociology, that is I would want to see it as a subject with mutual beneficial interrelationships in a school context with these two subjects. I prefer diminishing unity, (and this may be controversial?) with biology, archaeology and physical anthropology. This is one point where I very much agree with Leach in his analysis and that is the potentially disastrous effects of a school anthropology or **any** anthropology which allows itself to be drawn into a kind of biological determinism, based on the behaviour of animals. In fact in one way, I would see it as an almost total answer to Leach's views that anthropology should not be taught in schools. One reason must be that unless we do, pupils are going to be taken in by facile comparisons with animals which I think are totally inappropriate. It is not surprising that Leach and I agree about this because the development that I am suggesting, that is the diminishing contradiction with history, psychology and sociology and the diminishing unity with biology, archaeology and physical anthropology, represents in biological terms phylogeny repeating itself in ontogeny!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That is it represents in microcosm what, historically has been the development of anthropology as an academic discipline.

Because the history of anthropology, as I have been defining it (which is largely social anthropology) has been the separation out from biology, archaeology and physical anthropology, I shall have to compress the argument but hope to stimulate you to read Gluckman's **Politics, Law and Ritual,** Lucy Mair's **Introduction to Social Anthropology** and Levi Strauss's **Anthropology and History.**

Anthropology started, as all these books point out, by collecting curious facts about people; facts about their 'bodily habits,' whether their heads were round or long, whether their bottoms stuck out, facts about their bone structure, facts about their material culture and strange customs. Later, people who lived in exotic areas, were (for reasons which I will explore directly) encouraged to observe the customs of the people among whom they lived. What tended to happen (and I shall come back to this at a new level) was that they concentrated on rather dramatic events; on ceremonies.

There was an example of this on the radio this morning. There was a nice Doctor who was saying "The trouble with the English is that they don't touch each other enough." He was asked for his evidence and said, "You've only got to go to any church and see parents with their children. They stand apart and don't touch their children in church." The interviewer was not unreasonably surprised and asked why should people touch each other in church? The Doctor said, "Well church is a place where people are supposed to accept love and so, therefore, they ought to touch each other." The interviewer said, "How do you know they don't touch each other when they get home?" And, being a doctor, he retreated to the great myth of doctors when faced with a difficult question and said, "I know from my clinical experiance!" The point I am making is that he deduced from the things he could observe and the things that he could observe were public ceremonies. Initially anthropology tended to be about life crisis rituals and ceremonials. The reason why the missionaries and others were encouraged to do this was because there were people back home, whom we occasionally refer to as the armchair anthropologists, who wanted to explain how it was that particular customs, magic and religion had developed and they wanted this kind of material to be sent to them. The kinds of material they received were descriptions of particular ceremonies of various kinds. Don't take it that I am against ceremonies. I have in fact written a paper myself calling for more observation of ceremony and ritual in our own urban lives.

The original kind of material however was ceremonies and very little else. The kinds of ways that anthropologists at home used this information (which was in fact the only way it could be used) was to try to think themselves into the intellectual processes that had caused people to behave in a particular way.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gluckman has called this the 'If I were a horse' school of anthropology. Supposing I was a primitive man and I was faced with the elements and so on what would I do? How would I have arrived at magic and religion? To us this seems naive and simplistic but as Gluckman has again pointed out the idiot of the third generation can outshine the genius of three generations before. It is very easy for us now with hindsight to see the flaws in this kind of reasoning.

The famous American anthropologist, Lewis H. Morgan, was the first to spend a really long time in the field and to try to see a society (the Iroquois) as a whole. Significantly he had a major influence on Marx and Engels and hence the development not just of anthropology but of social sciences as a whole. The situation was changed in anthropology by the unity of theory and practice. At one level that is, the people who did the theorising and thinking now also started to collect the data. The first stages of this in Britain (which people often overlook) occurred when people like Haddon and W. H. R. Rivers and Seligman travelled to the Torres Straits, to the Sudan and to Malaysia and stayed for a period of say a week in one place. They observed what went on immediately and this gave them the possibility of seeing not just ceremonies, not just terms of kinship, but some kind of picture of how the ceremonies fitted into daily life and how kinship terms worked out in practice. If I can break in here and give a personal experience, when I was an anthropology student, I was taught that cattle people in East Central Africa eat meat only when the animals die or when they are killed for a special ceremony like a funeral. From this I inferred that they did not eat meat very often. It was only when I got to East Central Africa that I realised that this meant that people eat meat very often since there were funerals every weekend. Just like, if I can say it without being ambiguous, the British have their Sunday joint. However, that is phylogeny repeating itself in ontogeny again.

There is an oft-told tale and well known story about Malinowski being interned which I will not repeat here, the important thing is that an essential part of development of anthropology became the long period of fieldwork, the protracted stay with the people you were interested in. Of course you collect quite a different kind of material about the relationships between people through living with them for a long time. Incidentally this is a point which anthropology reached in 1914-15 and which many sociologists have not yet reached.

Many sociological surveys are based on a much shorter contact with the people they are studying than the expedition to the Torres Straits in the 1890's.

If you consider for example a famous study like **The Affluent Worker** and you add up the number of hours and minutes that Goldthorpe and Lockwood themselves spent in talking to workers in Luton, I think it may well come to less than the amout of time that Seligman spoke to people on his gunboat going down the Nile or the others in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the Torres Straits. So that Anthropology, through Malinowski and to some extent Radcliffe Brown, achieved the unity of theory and practice; achieved a situation in which the scientist immersed himself for relatively long periods of time in the life of the people that he was studying.

I think people often present this as if there was a very sharp break between the intellectualists and the fieldworkers. You might describe Malinowski's method as, "If a Trobriand Islander was a horse." This has tended to be the way in which the anthropologists have thought since. If a tribal member whom I studied was a horse, this is how he would behave.

One must not overlook the fact that Frazer, in particular, was beginning to ask the sort of questions that could only be answered by fieldworkers. It was not as incidental and accidental as might appear. Frazer was already asking questions like, "What is the good of magic to people who practise it?"

It also happened (or perhaps it did not just happen, perhaps a sociologist or historian of knowledge would tell us that this was all tied up together) that this particular method of fieldwork coincided with particular developments in international relations, of Britain in particular, which made it something which one could go on doing and something which in some senses appeared to be useful in the national interest. I refer to the historical conjuncture with imperialism. Out of this new detailed knowledge of process rather than of characteristics or structure it became possible for anthropologists once more to begin to make generalizations at a new kind of level. They were able to make generalizations about kinship, to make generalizations about descent, to make generalizations about the nature of myth. And, out of these generalizations and further fieldwork that was done, new approaches to anthropology have developed which I can only mention without describing in detail. I have in mind the extended case study method in England; in France, the development of structuralism and the attempts to relate anthropolgy to linguistics; in the United States, cognitive anthropology. One of the interesting things about anthropology is that it seems to proceed much more clearly than other sciences in what the learned call a helical fashion and what the rest of us call spiral. That is it keeps on returning at a new level of knowledge to problems which it had been thought had been relegated to a level that anthropology was no longer interested in. Structuralism and linguistics are examples of this. In America where the links between psychology and anthropology have always been greater than they have been here (perhaps because the influence of Durkheim was less marked) the ideas of cognitive anthropology and a different kind of relationship with language have developed.

Now I want to conclude with a dialectic of Leach and anti-Leach because if my argument is clear, contracted as it has been, and if one read the books which I have mentioned, the roots of Leach's argument become apparent. He argues that anthropologists by the nature of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

their work have to adopt, for academic purposes, a moral relativism. That does not mean to say, as he points out fairly forcibly, that the anthropologist himself is any more immoral or amoral than the sociologist, but it does mean that when they come across a set of norms in a particular society they are not in a position as are 'enlightened' missionaries to say, "Your ideas are contrary to natural law and cannot be accepted." They have to accept the moral norms of the society they are studying for the purpose at least of the study and when they then describe this society they have to set them out objectively as they seem to the people (not an easy task).

Leach suggests that for school children to be made aware that there are other moral norms than those of their teachers (heaven help the poor little dears!) is very dangerous for them.

Now this seems to me to be pedagogical nonsense and there must be a reason why a man who is as intelligent as Leach, shows that kind of apparent naivety. I think it is because of the way in which anthropology has developed, particularly within the older universities, detached from a kind of detailed knowledge of modern society and the modern school. Barbara Pym, in a novel, calls anthropologists more than men and **Less than Angels**, and Alison Lurie in her **Imaginary Friends** deals with just this point and makes gentle fun of participant observation sociology.

Leach's second moral point is that if we teach them anthropology kids will also discover that there are societies which manage without schools and this will lead to truancy. These are the moral arguments against anthropology in the school and they are both familiar. I remember many years ago going to a joint conference of the Association of Social Anthropologists with school teachers about the teaching of anthropology in school. At this discussion someone who was teaching social anthropology at a College of Education said that she had very great doubts about this exercise because she had noticed that the illegitimacy rate in girls in the first year of college was very low but that it rose sharply in the second year and the anthropology course was given in the first year. Leach's moral arguments I find unconvincing. However, the later points in Leach's paper are more serious perhaps. He suggests that the kind of questions that schools want answered by Social Science are the questions of naive funtionalism. Why does Man need religion, need science? And so on. Secondly there is a confusion in the minds of various educational philosophers, between education as a life long process and education as an institutional process. These two questions deserve answer, because they are both important. The answer to the first one seems to me that Leach lacked the faith in our discipline, the whole lesson of which seems to be that it is specifically by the study of the very specific that general principles can be illuminated. This seems to me to fit in very well with unconfused educational philosophy. So that if anthropology is taught in schools — and I hope that it will be — then I hope that it will be taught in terms of specifics and not in terms of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

generalisations. Teachers have to talk about societies or a society rather than Society.

A quotation from Chairman Mao at this point would seem very apposite.

"Some comrades fail to realize that the university of contradiction lies especially in its particularity. That may be obscure to most of you but the point is that if you want to understand general principles, you have to study very specific situations and this is really one of the major things that Anthropology has to offer.

As for the confusion between education as a lifelong process and education as an institution, this is precisely the direction in which right-thinking, or better still left-thinking, teachers want education to go. The whole discussion which has developed about E.P.A's and R.O.S.L.A., has been precisely along the lines of integrating education with the community. There are already, as many of you will know, interesting experiments of this kind going on in a few parts of England and in many parts of Scandinavia. So that Leach's objections, while they need to be taken seriously, do not hold up when we see them in the context of academic anthropology as a discipline rather than as an institution tucked away in London, Oxford and Cambridge, Manchester and Durham. His objections to applying them to education spring from a lack of knowledge which he is entitled to have about what is actually going on in education outside the older university system.

I would like, very briefly, to be more positive and say that the two major things which education can get from the teaching of anthropology is help in helping pupils to see things, particularly social institutions, as a whole and to see them as processes rather than structures. I do not think that this is something that they can get as easily from any other subject. I can see that geographers might well reply, "What about Geography?" But I would stand by that statement.

This brings us face to face with a very difficult paradox which I can illustrate by reading a quotation from Malinowski. Malinowski said, "The Anthropologist must relinquish his comfortable position in the long chair of the missionary compound, government station or planter's bungalow where, armed with a pencil and notebook and, at times with a whisky and soda, he has been accustomed to collect statements from informants. (I think he was knocking Radcliffe Brown actually because there was a picture in the first edition of the Andaman Islanders, showing Radcliffe Brown doing just this). "He must go out into the villages and see the natives at work, in the gardens, on the beach and in the jungle. He must sail with them to distant sandbanks and to foreign tribes and observe them in fishing, trading and ceremonial overseas exhibitions. Information must come to him full flavoured from his own observations of native life, not squeezed out

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of reluctant informants as a trickle of salt. Fieldwork can be done first — or second-hand, even among the savages in the middle of pile dwellings not far from actual cannibalism and head hunting. Open-air anthropology as opposed to hearsay note-taking is hard work, but it is also great fun. Only such anthropology can give us the all-round vision of primitive man and of primitive culture."

This is Malinowski. And this is the paradox for here I am saying, O.K. anthropology should be taught to school children; on the other hand I'm agreeing with Malinowski that anthropology is a subject which you do rather than a subject which you just think. So that if anthropology is to be taught in schools this paradox has to be resolved.

When I looked at the programme for this conference, I was delighted to see that we were going to spend most of our time 'at the movies'. This gives us the first way of resolving this paradox. We can use film. And we can use film not only to show people the excellent ethnological films which there are but also feature films. We can use film as a fieldwork situation in which we get our pupils critically to analyse ongoing social processes as we see them on film.

Then we can use these methods, which we can learn ourselves and help our pupils to learn through watching film to analyse our own society. Because we are surrounded by society and having seen the way, through books, in which anthropologists can analyse a society in terms of process and total systematic interrelation, we can then carry this further. We can try analysing together, material presented first of all on ethnographic film and then on feature film. Finally, we can use these insights to get ourselves and our pupils to analyse situations in which they and we find ourselves all the time.

As we do this we can hope to get pupils to adopt a critical and questioning attitude towards society. Thereby we may arrive at a morality and (perhaps) even a liking for school which is based not as Leach would seem to wish it to be on not knowing that there is any alternative, but upon having looked at what there is, having decided what is good in it and what is bad and having adopted a positive morality towards it, based as human life ought to be on choice from perceived and known-about alternatives.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE STUDY OF POLITICS

* SUSANNE WOOD

Like other members of the panel I have been asked to talk as briefly as possible about the connection at the level of theory between anthropology and my subject, in this case politics. My own background in social anthropology and my present interest in political sociology may explain my receptivity to the ideas and methods of anthropology, a view which might not be shared by other students of politics.

There are four elements which I see as basic to the anthropological perspective which can raise interesting questions for the study of politics. Firstly and most obviously are the facts that the material used by anthropologists comes from 'other cultures' and that anthropology hinges on the comparative method. There is thus in anthropology an inevitable comparison with the observer's own culture and anthropologists carefully avoid generalising from single instances.

For the student of politics therefore simply being confronted with data from other cultures which do not fit easily into the accepted paradigms of Western political thought can be an important antidote to the parochialism and ethnocentrism of much political theory. Classically, Hobbes' view that without the state there would be only anarchy has been clearly refuted by evidence such as that provided by Evans-Pritchard in his study of **The Nuer.** In defence of Hobbes one might say that political theory is essentially prescriptive and is meant to be so: but ethnographic data from state-less societies helps to make clear these assumptions.

One danger in this can be that the ethnographic data may appear so bizarre that it is incomprehensible and thus fails to shake one's existing preconceptions.

The study of pre-literate societies which do not have the formal trappings of state apparatus can show us how much of our political theory is synonymous with the theory of the state. Where anthropologists like Gluckman in **Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society** and Leach in **Political Systems of High'and Burma** have clearly demonstrated the importance of politics in stateless societies, crucial questions about the scope of the political field are raised. One cannot thereafter continue to equate politics simply with the workings of the state apparatus. This is not to say that one dispenses with a consideration of the state but that one is bound to consider the specific historical conditions that give rise to state formation and the structural conditions that underpin this. One is also led to look

* Dr. Wood is Lecturer in Political Sociology, Birkbeck College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for political actions in contemporary societies that take place outside the formal system of the state machinery. This view frees one from the impasse of an institutional analysis and allows for a consideration of the dynamic properties of political systems.

The second basic element in the anthropological approach to which I want to refer is this: by virtue of studying societies other than their own anthropologists have taken as a cardinal principle the rule of objectivity and detachment in their studies. This self-reflection, the constant searching for preconceived prejudices and assumptions to which anthropologists subject themselves and to which they are subjected by their colleagues, could usefully be injected into the discipline of political science. The implied 'goodness' of Western democracy on which much contemporary Western political sociology rests might be examined more critically if the principles of anthropology were to influence our procedures. This can be taken too far of course and some anthropologists have appeared so concerned with remaining detached and uninvolved that until recently they have failed to take a stand on crucial political questions on which they were qualified to speak. The facts of exploitation and even extermination of which anthropologists must in many instances have been aware were largely ignored in anthropological writings.

The third feature which is crucial to the anthropological credo is the emphasis on the technique of participant observation. Although, as the societies they study have become larger and more complex and less "authentic" (in Levi-Strauss' terms), different techniques borrowed from sociology and psychology have been introduced, yet, participant observation remains the anthropologist's main technique and his own singular contribution to the methodology of the social sciences. This method can and has been used in the study of political processes in our own society to describe what actually happens in politics rather than what ought to happen (for example, Vidich and Bensman's **Small Town in Mass Society** and Frankenberg's study of political activity in a Welsh village).

Finally, the fourth of what I see as the main items to distinguish the anthropological approach. I refer here to the emphasis on viewing society as a **totality.** Perhaps because of the nature of the societies anthropologists have traditionally studied, their stress lies on the interconnections between different aspects of social organisation. Politics is thus seen as an **aspect** of social life (rather than as a separate formal institutional system) which has interconnections with for instance economic, technological, social and religious aspects of social life. Perhaps the most useful of these studies are those which relate the type and form of political organisation to the level of economic development.

The danger to be avoided here is that of the 'naive functionalism' to which Leach refers. The social anthropology of Radcliffe-Brown

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which dominated British studies until recently made four assumptions:

1. the primary of the social
2. the idea of an almost mechanical balance necessarily being reached in a given period of time between different aspects of social structure.
3. the idea of the social order being based on concensus.
4. the idea of the bounded nature of the social entity.

For the analysis of politics these four assumptions raise key problems which have to be dealt with before a rapprochement can be reached between politics and anthropology. Where politics is concerned, the interesting questions are those relating to how the social order is maintained where concensus does not exist. Gluckman has shown that this is quite often the case in pre-literate societies. The other major question which interests students of politics is that of how change occurs in a political structure. The precepts of functionalism do not help to clarify these issues. Furthermore in their efforts to avoid the pitfalls of the earlier evolutionists and diffusionists, functionalists produced a school of thought which was fundamentally ahistorical. In societies which had no written history evidence had to be very carefully collected but this was not to be taken as accepting that they had no history at all.

What I am saying therefore is that one has to carefully select what books one uses when attempting to bring politics and anthropology together. Here I am recommending the work of Gluckman, Nadel, Bailey, Balandier and Leach for example; that is, studies which are concerned with the operation of power and the strategies this implies. Studies like these raise questions of the definition of the political order; they dispel the dominance of theories of the state over political theory; they focus on the dynamism inherent in the political structure and, in this emphasis on process and change, they revive the old debate about the relationship of traditional societies to history. These are some of the questions with which political science could be concerned and were this so much could be gained from a closer collaboration between the two disciplines.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GEOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

* R. S. JOBY

The detailed study of other societies by anthropologists has been of great importance to the geographers who seek to understand the impact of man on the land on which he lives.

The broad field of human geography overlaps anthropology and uses much data from it. Earlier writers showed less awareness of differences and more of the essential unity of studying man-land relationships. The German founder of human geography, Friedrich Ratzel, gave his earliest major work in this field the title "Anthropogeography" in 1882. The British pioneer in the field, H. J. Fleure, saw anthropology, geography and history as an almost inseparable trio. This was amply demonstrated in his "Natural History of Man in Britain."

Many of the early studies, especially American studies under the influence of Ellsworth Huntingdon, suffered from an undue degree of environmental determinism, which posited that man's actions were determined by the environment in which he lived. As evidence from more and more studies in the inter-war period indicated varied responses to similar environments, the alternative philosophy of possibilism took root among human geographers.

More recently, the quantity of data forthcoming in geographical research has been so great that the use of the computer has become necessary. Mathematical regularities are sought in farming techniques, settlement patterns and transport networks, to mention but a few. The analysis and explanation of these response patterns to environment are sought in the more detailed studies of the anthropologist. The "new" geography, as it is becoming known, complements and enriches ways of using data rather than entirely ousting descriptive and verbal analyses of man-land relationships.

The Open University has tried to re-integrate the Social Sciences including human geography, in its D 100 foundation course. Here H. C. Brookfield's study of the New Guinea Chimbu people from "Geography as Human Ecology" is used as a comparative article, contrasted with the areal patterns of other societies. Students note the overlaps between the social sciences and show a strong desire for integration towards the end of the course.

* Richard Joby is Head of Department of Geography and Geology, North Walsham High School

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New G.C.E. syllabuses encourage detailed study of settlement, agriculture and population so that teachers with an anthropological background can introduce films, monograph studies and problem-oriented exercises using strongly contrasted societies as examples. The great enemy, as always, is time, and unfortunately the teacher cannot stray far outside the geographical aspects of anthropology without sacrificing time on other syllabus topics. More generalized social science papers, or perhaps interdisciplinary papers linked to allow for multiple credits, may be the answer to the compartmentalization which the geography syllabuses at present necessitate.

After more than a century of fission there are encouraging signs that both teachers and taught would like to pull down the barriers which have arisen between the different fields of social science. This was very evident from much that was said at the conference and from the interests of the speakers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTHROPOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

* DAVID SEDDON

The crisis in the social sciences

It has become clear over the last few years that we are witnessing an unprecedented crisis in the social sciences. Whether the discipline is sociology, history, anthropology or economics the picture is much the same: radical changes are taking place and a fundamental rethinking is necessary. Recently Banaji has referred to 'the crisis in anthropology' (Banaji 1970) and Ardener, in his Malinowski Memorial Lecture, has spoken of the 'new' anthropology (Ardener 1971). In history, Stedman-Jones has written of 'the poverty of empiricism' (Stedman-Jones 1972), while in sociology Gouldner talks of 'the coming crisis of Western sociology,' argues for a new kind of 'reflexive' or self-aware sociology and has himself been criticised for the tameness of his critique (Shaw 1972). In economics it has been suggested that "the entire school of economic theory going back to the 1870's is now under attack (Hunt and Swartz 1972: 32). Most seem agreed that this crisis in the social sciences requires fundamental changes in our ideas about the theory and method of social science, in our acceptance of the 'natural' division of social science into such compartments as sociology, anthropology, economics, psychology, political science and history, and in our basic unwillingnes to consider the history of the development of social science as a necessary part of our task as social scientists.

Social scientists today are obliged to confront a number of basic assumptions of which two are central to the present configuration of the social sciences: the division of social science into a plethora of disciplines and sub-disciplines, each of which provides a partial and inadequate idea of the way in which society and societies change and are structured, and the idea that a morally neutral and **scientific** (as opposed to ideological) social science is possible within the existing framework of academic endeavour in Western industrial capitalist society.

Economics and political economy

The academic social sciences are at present fragmented and compartmentalised; each discipline or sub-discipline has its own overwhelming literature, its own specialised — and often to the outsider, incomprehensible — jargon. But it was not always so. As Rothschild has observed, "early classical 'political economy' right up to the days of J. S. Mill was fully aware of the sociological and power background of economic events . . . It was only in its later stages that the main strand of traditional economic thinking turned inwards towards 'purely' economic matters, paying increasingly less regard to extra-market and power affairs" (Rothschild 1971: 8). One

* David Seddon is Lecturer in Sociology, Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the most important causes of this later development was the complete victory of 'perfect competition' as the basic model for economic theorising. But it is crucial to realise that, even in the West, "perfect competition was at no time — even in the days of nineteenth century small-scale business — an adequate description of economic reality" (Rothschild 1971: 8). Albert has argued that "... the vision of the classicists contains a synthesis of elements belonging, when judged by contemporary methodological standards, to totally heterogeneous categories of thought. Their analysis of the contemporanexously unfolding industrial society — arising out of their **metaphysical** background of natural law and utilitarian thinking — fused elements of **market sociology** with rudiments of a **logical** theory of rational action, all being part of an **ideological** concept that tended to let the active interplay of market transactions appear as 'connected in a meaningful way,' resulting in a tendency to single out certain social forms as optimal (Albert 1971 : 24). Rothschild points out that "the disregard of power aspects is greatly helped by the fact that concentration on the mechanics of economic and market adjustment within a given framework, enables the economist to avoid the detailed occupation with facts which powerful social groups prefer to keep under a cloud of uncertainty" (Rothschild 1971: 11).

It becomes clear that if one considers, not merely the **object** (subject matter) of the social sciences and the **theory and method** of the social sciences, but also the **historical development of their theory and method in its social context,** one is on the way to being able to ask important questions not only **by means** of the social sciences but also **of** the social sciences themselves and thus about their status as sciences **in society** as well as sciences **of society.**

If we consider economics today we find an extraordinary gradation from 'pure' theory, through monetary economics, fiscal economics, labour economics, welfare economics, industrial economics, international economics, and 'development' economics, and so on. Economists analysing the economy are rather like those famous blind men sitting on an elephant, each one describing the small piece of elephant he could feel; the sum of the descriptions and interpretations being based on partial and inadequate information, adding up, not to the living animal but to a bizarre monstrosity bearing little resemblance to anything that ever lived — in other words a mythical creature. In addition to this fragmentation of a fragment of social science we find that each of these categories operates with a set of assumptions in which certain historically and socially determined values are implicit:

1) acceptance of the socio-economic institutional structure as given. Thus capitalism defines the constraints and the economist's task is clear within these bounds;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2) a premise of social harmony. Apart from a few 'frictions' and difficulties there are no irreconcilable conflicts of interest between social groups. Economics analyses 'transactions' in a 'game' without fully investigating the 'rules';

3) an extreme individualism, associated with the concept of perfect competition, and an inevitable failure to recognise 'class' as a significant factor, or to deal adequately with 'monopoly';

4) a belief that the state, although considered necessary, is an impartial arbitrator, not committed to any class or group.

5) an almost total lack of historical perspective, making it impossible to analyse how the 'rules' (the socio-economic structure) developed;

6) an almost total lack of a comparative perspective, leading to the equation of 'economics' with 'economics in Western industrial capitalist society'.

These assumptions do not merely limit, they overwhelm and invalidate academic economics as a **science** and reveal, when made explicit, its essentially **ideological** nature. The 'correction' of these implicit biases and assumptions would involve, necessarily, the dismantling of economics as we know it. And this must be done, for at present economics is partial and inadequate. A complete overhaul would necessitate a total rethinking, not only of 'economics' as a discipline, but also of 'history' (the historical perspective), of 'sociology' (conflict and class), of 'political science' (power and the State) and of 'anthropology' (the comparative perspective), and the construction of an integrated social science with an adequate theory and method.

This is clearly an immense task, and cannot be explored here. Suffice it to say that, for some, "all things cry out give us new forms, new ways of thinking a new political economy! A New Political Economy that encompasses economics, sociology, history, art, literature, poetry. The negation of the atomistic compartmentalization of development economics, labour economics, industrial economics, business economics . . . "A science of the purely human, universal basis of the production of material wealth for human needs" (Hunt and Swartz 1972: 33).

In the meanwhile, let us simply consider whether 'anthropology,' as constituted at present, with all its inadequacies and internal crises of its own, can help 'economics' to reconsider its object, its theory and method, and itself as a 'science.'

'Anthropology' and 'economics'

'Anthropology,' by confronting 'economics' with the result of its investigations and analyses of societies structured differently from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

our own, raises crucial questions about economics itself and its validity as a social **science,** as well as about the way in which these societies, and our own, are structured. This is the fundamental contribution of 'anthropology,' not merely to 'economics,' but also to 'politics' and 'sociology.'

By definition comparative, 'anthropology' obliges us to compare, not only other kinds of society with each other, but also other kinds of society with our own and, equally importantly (and perhaps less obviously), to compare our society with other kinds of society. To compare not only Them with Them, but also Them with Us and **Us with Them;** to break down the implicit assumption, first, that we constitute the norm and second, that we constitute the ideal, and to establish the basis for a comparative science of society. By presenting a range of kinds of society, anthropology makes possible (but not, unfortunately, necessarily more than this) a scientic theory of social variation. As Edmund Leach has suggested: "In its essence, my kind of social anthropology is the comparative study of varieties of human social organisation. The **educational** value of such study is that it shows that many things that we are inclined to take for granted, because they happen to be customary in our own way of life, might be managed quite differently. Such a demonstration ought to lead to self-criticism. Why should we think that such and such a manner of behaving is right and proper rather than something quite different" (Leach 1973).

It is important to realise that there is always a strong possibility that racism and ethnocentrism will come to dominate such theories of social variation, but 'anthropology' has traditionally provided some counter to this in its usually implicit (but sometimes explicit) adoption of a relativistic position in which no society is a **priori** better than another, no culture inherently superior to another. Although the comparative method adopted by 'anthropology' in the nineteenth century, with its associations with ideas of social evolution and development, came to be stripped of its evolutionary and developmental associations at the 'high point' of British 'anthropology' during the 1930's and 1940's, and was reduced to a simple comparison of structures and functions, it still has some value for 'economics' — which has also abandoned a historical perspective in favour of an essentially static mode of analysis with a limited time horizon. (It should be noted, however, that the association of comparison with ideas of development was often merely driven underground to emerge once again in the work of 'applied anthropologists,' 'development anthropologists' and 'development economists').

Comparison **can,** as Leach has observed, (and should?), lay open the way for the questioning and possibly the breaking of the ethnocentric (self-centred) starting point of such disciplines as 'economics.' It can demonstrate the important differences between societies and cultures, and it can demonstrate the important similarities. What 'anthropology' as at present constituted cannot do, is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to go beyond the **mere comparison** of kinds of society to an explanation of differences and the similarities in terms of a coherent theory of the development of social forms (kinds of society).

But, in trying to define and identify the differences and the similarities, 'anthropology' raises the question of whether concepts and categories — modes of understanding and explanation — designed in Western capitalist society for the analysis of that society can also contribute to the understanding and explanation of processes and structures in societies structured differently from our own. In the case of 'economics' it raises the question of whether the concepts and categories of economic theory can be applied fruitfully to societies structured differently, or, in other words, whether the concepts and categories of 'economics' are generally valid (applicable) or only particularly. It obliges us to ask: how generally valid, how scientific, is economics? usually hailed as the most scientific and generally effective of the social sciences.

There are two main parts to this question. The first part relates to the problem of how far and how effectively economic concepts and economic theory developed in the West under capitalism, may be used in societies where the essential characteristics of capitalism: money, commodities (in the strict sense), capital, prices, wage-labour, etc. either do not exist, do not appear to exist or else exist in an alien form. If 'economics' as we know it cannot be used effectively in the analysis and explanation of processes and structures in these other kinds of society, as many economists and anthropologists believe, then is it, in any sense, a universal or general science concerned with the 'economic,' whatever that is, or is it merely a particular set of concepts and categories applicable only to one of many kinds of social and economic systems: western industrial capitalism? The second part arises out of the initial questioning of the adequacy and effectiveness of 'economics' in analysing other kinds of society, in combination with the comparative perspective of 'anthropology' and the investigation of the history of 'economics' itself. It asks about the extent to which the theory and method of 'economics,' as usually taught and learned in schools and universities in the West, with all the implicit assumptions and hidden value judgements mentioned in the previous section, really does explain or account for the major features of our own society. In other words it asks if 'economics,' if we accept that it may not be a general science, is even able to understand and explain how modern industrial capitalism works, or whether it provides merely a partial and **ideological,** as opposed to a **'scientific,** explanation of modern industrial capitalism.

'Anthropology' by investigating and analysing societies where the 'social' and the 'economic' appear inextricably intertwined and where the institutional differentiation of our own society does not exist, first questions the applicability of 'economics'' as a science to this kind of society, apparently so different from our own (this is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the direct confrontation of 'economics' with 'anthropology') and then, by demonstrating, through the comparative method, that 'social' and 'economic' are not, in practice, distinct in our own society, questions the applicability of 'economics' — as the science of the 'economy,' with its selective interpretation of what is crucial in the 'economy' — to our own society (this is the indirect confrontation of 'economics' with 'anthropology').

'Anthropology' questions and challenges 'economics.' Despite its own inadequacies it retains two essential aspects of any adequate approach to the study of society: a comparative framework and a wholistic framework. In 'anthropology,' at least traditionally, it was the whole society that was studied and the relationship between the different parts of the whole constituted the main concern of the anthropologist. 'Anthropology' traditionally 'took on' the same range of problems in other kinds of society as 'sociology,' 'economics' and 'political science' 'take on' in Western capitalist society. Unfortunately there is a growing tendency in 'anthropology' to fragment, like 'economics,' and we are beginning to see the development of 'economic anthropology,' 'political anthropology,' and so on, but for anyone teaching 'economics' in schools or universities today 'anthropology' still provides a valuable, an essential counter to the excessively uncomparative and fragmented discipline of 'economics.'

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

USING MUSIC TO PRESENT CONCEPTS IN ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

* EDITH KING

For many years now this educational sociologist has used music to assist her in a presentation of concepts in sociology, anthropology and linguistics to groups of children and teachers, to parents, to colleagues, and to community and church groups comprising heterogenerous audiences. It is not difficult for the teacher, particularly the primary school teacher with some musical training, to incorporate a musical context in teaching the social sciences. There is a natural affinity between the two areas.

Describing Socialization

Lullabies can be utilised to present elements of a theory of socialization, the process of bringing the individual into the human group. The first song the baby hears is usually one that sings of love and affection for the infant. Cross-cultural variations are highlighted by the content of the lullabies from various cultures and societies — in France the lullaby sings of bringing the baby delicious foods; in Spain, lovely flowers; in Israel, wisdom and knowledge. Early in life the ear becomes attuned to the music of one's people. To exemplify this for an audience, one might sing the "Aizu Lullaby" first in the Japanese style, with chopped or broken-off phrasing at the end of each line in the melody; then, sing the lullaby again in the Western style with the ends of the phrase held out, or "legato," asking the audience whether the first or the second version seemed more satisfying and familiar to their ears. Not unexpectedly, the audience will show preference for this second version.

Another interesting feature of socialization can be effectively demonstrated through the use of lullabies from differing cultures. It is through this vehicle that the infant learns very early in life about his immediate environment and what is important in his culture — goats, monkeys, or even cars! For example, in the Middle East one finds the old lullaby "Raisins and Almonds" in which a little goat trots to the market to bring back rasins and almonds for the baby. In the Middle East the goat is indeed a very important animal in the culture. By way of contrast a lullaby, from Nigeria "Sleep My Baby," the child hears about the monkey sleeping safely in his mother's arms. In American lullabies and children's songs animals such as horses and lambs appear ("All the Pretty Little Horses" for example). It might be noted that some social scientists, such as Desmond Morris, have done cross-cultural studies on animal preferences of children and adults in various cultures which are supportive of the above. (Desmond Morris, **The Human Zoo.** New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969).

* Edith King is Associate Professor of Educational Sociology, University of Denver

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Enculturation

Sociologists and anthropologists have delineated another dynamic process that goes hand in hand with socialization. This is the process of enculturation, or the internalization of the values and attitudes of one's group of people or one's society. Children's songs and folk songs can be used in unique and charming ways to expand the theory of enculturation.

Here are some examples of enculturation in song:

Let us look cross-culturally at how early in their formative years children are internalizing the values of their society. If we journey to France and visit "les jardins d'engants," the schools for young children, we find the children are learning the famous and world-wide French song, "Sur le Pont d'Avignon" or "On the Bridge of Avignon." Children learn about the important landmarks and geographical locations in their country or culture through the songs they are taught in early childhood. Here immortalized in song is a small town in the south of France. Because of this song, French-speaking people all over the world know of the town of Avignon and its famous bridge. Another example of how children are imbued with the culture and its values, through learning about famous landmarks, is found in the song "Les Cloches," or "The Bells." Here the children sing about the bells of the great cathedrals of France: Orleans, Beaugency, Notre-Dame; "Quelle chagrin, quelle ennui"—what boredom, to toll all the hours — this song says. Meanwhile though, through this simple ditty, this children's song, the individual is being enculturated with important values of his society, here represented by the magnificent cathedrals, hallmarks of French Catholicism.

One more example, taken again from the French songs of childhood that demonstrate how subtly and unconsciously we socialize and enculturate people, can be portrayed with the song "A Que Lieu, Lieu." This song sings, as the group of children make a line holding each other around the waists and move slowly to the words, "In a line we go, in a line we go." So, in this culture, as in our own, we wait our turn by making a line. We line up for the drinking fountain, for the pencil sharpener, for the lavatory, etc. Thus, the very young child is enculturated with customs and traditions of his group.

Let us move to another culture for more examples of how the individual, early in life, learns the ways of his group. In Israel the child sings about important holidays. Here the cross-cultural perspective helps us to see that the Christian world's celebrations — Christmas, New Year's on January the first, Thanksgiving, Easter, Valentine's Day — are not necessarily universal holidays the world over. In fact, probably two-thirds of the world's people do not celebrate the birth of Christ at Christmas time. This is an important fact that American children seldom realize, even in the global community of the present. Viewing holidays cross-culturally is an excellent way to get across this point to children and adults alike. So

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Israeli children learn about the holidays of their culture through songs like "Lama Sukah Zu" or "Why Do We Build This Temporary House?" This song tells the child that at the fall festival of the Succoth his people commemorate the holiday by building a temporary house, with a roof of branches from which to hang the fruits of the harvest by taking their meals for eight days in this temporary shelter.

Even folk tunes as simple and modest as songs of greeting — how one says "hello" in the society — can demonstrate an underlying philosophy, the world view of the culture or country. The peoples of the Middle East say "Shalom" or "Peace be with you." Sometimes the rituals and customs attendant with the greeting mark the personality of a group of peoples: hostile, friendly, reticent, outgoing. This is illustrated by the doffing of the hat, the extending of the hand, the motion of beckoning to approach closer or stand back farther. Each group of people enculturates members with the "proper" technique for the in-group. What more dramatic way can there be to demonstrate cultural relativity in human nature?

Turning to examples in American culture, we can dramatically demonstrate through children's songs how early in life American children learn the values of their culture. Besides teaching the important holidays and festivals of the culture, the geographic sites and landmarks of the culture, the rituals and traditions of the culture, the young child is told about the important heroes and personalities in the history of his people. Take the apparently simple kindergarten song about Abraham Lincoln and note its implications for the inculcation of the "pecuniary philosophy" of American society, as Jules Henry, the anthropologist, so aptly labelled this trait.

> Abraham Lincoln, kind and good
> Was honoured and loved by many.
> To help us remember this president
> We put his face on a penny.

So, American children soon learn the value of having the monetary wherewithal to gratify ones needs and desires. Five-year-olds know well that five pennies make a nickel and five nickels make a quarter, that a dime is worth more than a nickel, even though the first coin is smaller in size than the second; and so on. Our society, like any other, indoctrinates its members to essential patterns of behaviour for functioning successfully in the group.

In recent years even the songs and stories of the nursery school have come under stiff scrutiny and censure by various concerned civil rights groups in American society — and with good cause. The story of Black Sambo, a disturbing racial stereotype, is typical of these elements of time-honoured children's literature that have been criticized. Poems, illustrations in famous editions of nursery rhymes, even some nursery rhymes, such as "Eenie Meenie, Miney, Moe" have been deleted from the materials used with young children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acculturation

Now let us turn to the use of folk songs and children's music to present the theory of acculturation or the changing of values and attitudes. As the individual grows to adulthood he or she comes in contact with an ever-widening circle of friends, relatives and acquaintances. One comes to learn about and experience many ways of doing things, many traditions, folkways, customs, and patterns of behaviour. Then the individual begins to modify the ways, the patterns, the beliefs that were held in childhood during enculturation. This then, is the process of acculturation.

The individual, as he matures, can even joke about some of the more painful experiences of enculturation through which he has passed, and view these experiences from a cross-cultural perspective. Contemporary folk songs and sometimes "drinking songs" make use of this source of their inspiration. Such a song is the English drinking song "Wee, Wee" which brings chuckles and even guffaw from young children and from adults. The words of the song joke about the toddler's experiences during toilet training.

When I was just a wee, wee tot
They took me from my wee, wee cot
They put me on my wee, wee pot
To see if I would wee or not.

When they saw that I would not
They took me from my wee, wee pot
They put me on my wee, wee cot
And there I wee'd and wee'd a lot.

Acculturation also involves examining the values of one's society for their validity and relevance to contemporary life. There is a whole body of modern folk songs and protest songs telling about the superficiality, the banality, the other-directedness (as described by David Riesman and others in **The Lonely Crowd,** New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961) of contemporary Americans. These songs are exemplified by Malvina Reynold's "Ticky, Tacky" or this song entitled "Happy, Happy New Year" whose verses describe so well Erving Goffman's theory of the "Big Con" those in American society are perpetrating on their neighbours.

A happy, happy new year for me more loans
But please oh Mr. President, let the poor get their own.
Let's have a minimum wage, at two an hour
With the work week only twenty-five hours
And coffee breaks, oh, coffee breaks . . .

The normal people now do say we'll have green hair
So I must make my hair green, so fair, so fair
But if they do, soon change to blue
Then I will quickly change mine too
To the same true blue, the same true blue . . .

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

And now that I have got these things,
More things, more things
I see that still my neighbors have
Things, more things
And so I must keep clawing high
Until I pass them by and by
And feel secure and feel secure . . .

Song by Dudley Weeks, from the record "The World as People."

Cultural Diffusion

Another concept of sociology and anthropology that can be demonstrated through music is the term **cultural diffusion,** or the spreading of a custom, trait, idea or folkway across cultures and countries, across oceans and continents. Cultural diffusion appropriately compliments the theory of acculturation, the changing and altering of values, beliefs, attitudes, and practices among the peoples of the world. Particularly today, with rapid communications, globe-encircling television, and rapid travel, all providing first-hand experiences, the diffusion of cultural traits is a phenomenon that children should be cognizent of and understand. Cultural diffusion of social customs, traditions, rituals, etc., also recognises the variations and mutations that occur as members of diverse cultures acquire each other's ideas or actions, artifacts or theories. A musical example of these variations is the following: Recalling the children's song from France "Les Cloches" which sings of the bells of the great cathedrals, Orleans, Beaugency, and Notre-Dame, one can then compare the contemporary folk song "Cathedral," written especially for the Wayfarers, a group that sang at the San Francisco bistro, the Hungry 1, some years ago. This dashing, melodic love song tells about the soldier, who leaves his mistress with the raven hair, for "seas to conquer on and lands to find." Yet the warrior returns in death to his native soil where the bells of the great cathedrals toll for him, the conquering hero. The bells of the great cathedrals appear in song at the end of each verse — Orleans, Beaugency, Notre-Dame de Paris, just as in the simple French children's song. "Cathedrals" is a stunning variation on the original theme, the great cathedrals of France, and a splendid example of cultural diffusion as well.

The Role of Language

The whole development of the theories of socialization, enculturation, and acculturation are intrinsic to the nature of man as a symbolizing animal. Man has language and this makes him a unique creature, a creature that can therefore be socialized, can be brought into the human group. It is exciting to present the concept of the relativity of language to young children through music. It is exciting because it can be done so effectively with simple children's songs. To illustrate, ask an audience, whether they be children or adults, "How do we say that a rooster crows?" Someone will invariably reply, "Cock-a-doodle-doo." One may then respond with the remark,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"But do roosters say 'Cock-a-doodle-doo' all over the world?" Let us see. No, not so. In France there is a song children sing about the rooster, "Tuon, le Coq" (Let's shoot the rooster); this rooster says 'Coke-a-dee, Coke-a-da.' Or in Israel the children sing, "Kumbakouratzail" (Wake up, the rooster is crowing) — 'Coo-coo-ree-ka, Coo-coo-ree-ka.'

From this example is it easy to demonstrate the relativity of language; language is the way men communicate; one way can be as effective as the other. There is no one superior language which some special group of people hold all their own. We like our way of speaking, but the way other people have of talking, their language, can be as meaningful and effective as our language is. Language is the means for organizing our thoughts and the way we explain to ourselves what is going on around us.

Bringing Spaceship Earth to the Primary School

To conclude this presentation on the use of music to present concepts in sociology and anthropology, we focus on the value orientation or the world view of societies and cultures. In today's multicultural world children need to hold a realistic world view. The traditional conception of the world, with its nationalistic states, boundary lines, and foreign people is an outmoded and detrimental view of the world. In a charming simile Kenneth Boulding, the internationally-known economist, philosopher and social commentator, gives to the teacher of young children a fresh and vital way of explaining the concept of the global community to youngsters. Drawing upon Barbara Ward's idea of the earth as a spaceship, Boulding tells us that no longer can we play cowboys and Indians on the 'Great Plain' of the world, chasing out the bad guys, pushing them off the edge, when we do not like them. Now we know the world is really like a Spaceship Earth, on which we all travel together in a closed system through the universe. If we pollute the air, the water, the land, and if our spaceship contains sick, warped, discontented people, we cannot push them away any longer; the pollution returns from down under through the 'closed pipes' of the system to haunt us and make us share the responsibility for the plight and trouble of all human beings, voyagers together on the Spaceship Earth. This analogy is very meaningful to young children. They quickly grasp the significance of the new world view and its implication for them. As the words of Spaceship Earth song, written by Pamela Hughes and myself, state:

The Spaceship Earth

We don't play cowboys anymore.
We don't play soldiers going to war.
No need to pretend, we are real spacemen,
With the whole universe to explore.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chorus

The universe is our frontier
And everyone is a pioneer.
Together in space, men's boundaries erase
With the whole universe to explore.

Worldmindedness is our goal.
With every person on the roll.
Spaceship Earth's degree
We live in unity
As the whole universe we explore.

A Song by Edith W. King and Pamela Hughes.

Erikson, Erik. **Childhood and Society.** New York: Norton and Co., Inc., 1950.

Elkin, Frederick. **The Child and Society.** New York: Random House, Inc., 1960.

Goffman, Erving. **Presentation of Self in Every Day Life.** New York: Doubleday and Co., 1959.

Goodman, Maryellen. **The Individual and Culture.** Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1967.

_____ **The Culture of Childhood.** New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia, 1970.

Henry, Jules. **Culture Against Man.** New York: Random House, 1963.

King, Edith. **The World Context for Teaching in the Elementary School.** Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1971

_____ **Educating Young Children: Sociological Interpretations.** Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1973.

Maier, H., editor. **Three Theories of Child Development,** second edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT ON THE 'CRITIQUE OF ANTHROPOLOGY' GROUP

Although this group met on all of the occasions timetabled, except the last, it proved difficult to develop a coherent and systematic critique of anthropology, partly because the participants changed over the four days of the Conference and partly because of the different interests and backgrounds of those involved at any one time. Despite these difficulties, the group was, I believe, able to discuss many important areas of interest and to develop certain lines of criticism of the intellectual and practical concerns of anthropologists and the relationship between these concerns and the development of the subject. It was advantageous, in certain respects, to have such a mixed group, for the 'professionals' were subjected to much healthy criticism by the non-professionals and the school teachers and those teaching in CFE's were able to learn something of the different positions adopted within anthropology. At the most general level of all it became clear that anthropology perhaps even more than any of the other social sciences comprises a number of different approaches, methods and concerns and that those seeking to make use of 'anthropology' in the class room are not obliged to restrict themselves to a particular version of anthropology and, indeed are free, to a certain extent, to construct their own anthropology for it can be argued that anthropology is a **practice** as much as anything.

The group began with a discussion of the main features of anthropology as it developed during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, and considered the extent to which some of these features have remained central in the subject and which have tended to become peripheral and unimportant. Of particular importance was the association of anthropology with colonialism and imperialism, and the central concern of anthropology to study and analyse the often very different societies and cultures which had come under colonial rule or into contact with Europeans. Within this concern to study 'other cultures' anthropology concentrated almost exclusively on 'primitive' tribal societies and the less-developed states, particularly of Africa. From the very beginning, when its preoccupations were as much linguistic and biological as social and cultural, anthropology was concerned with **comparison,** and the **variability** both of human types and of social-cultural types. The comparative method, with its interest in classification and the identification of similarities and differences, still remain central to contemporary anthropological concern. But such classification and comparison took place within the general context of the European expansion into Africa, Asia and Latin America and the domination and colonisation of these other types of society. Inherent in the early classifications, therefore, was the idea of a hierarchy of social and cultural types, in which European capitalist society appeared to be the highest form. Despite the efforts of the anthropologists of the 'classic' period of fieldwork, the 1920's to 1940's, to abandon these often fundamentally racist and supremacist schema

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by outlawing any attempt at conjectural history and by adopting a social and cultural relativism which denied 'superiority' to any society or culture, the implicit assumption that 'the Western way of life' was in some respects superior remained, if only in hiding. Jostling with this idea of Western superiority, however, was another important idea that had developed even earlier and which also remain central to much anthropology, that of the 'noble savage' — a romantic idealism which found in the life of 'primitive man' a 'pure' alternative to the 'corrupt' life of modern Western society. Today, with the growing concern for the devastating effects of industry on the environment, this romanticism in anthropology is becoming very attractive, to the professionals as well as to lay-men and the gentlemen of the media.

The ambiguous attitude within anthropological thought towards the 'native,' in which romantic idealism is a reaction against crude denial of humanity, in the most extreme case, reflects a tendency to objectify and caricature (whether as noble or as brutal) the 'native.' The best anthropology does not caricature but it does, and must, objectify.

The characteristic method by which anthropology collects and orders its 'raw data' — the observations made in the field and the statements recorded — is that of participant observation. By this technique, which involves the anthropologist as both observer and participant with the society he is studying anthropology has, since the 1920's, sought to both understand and explain 'native' culture and society. The attempt to both **experience** and to **analyse** poses, for the anthropologist, the problem of reconciling what are for him two diametrically opposed methods of gaining access to anoiher culture and society. It was this problem, that of experience as against analysis that absorbed the greater part of the discussion of the 'critique' group during the Conference. The majority felt, I believe, that since another culture and society is **essentially** different and **systematically** different we cannot hope to seize its central characteristics by remaining outsiders, observers and analysts, it is necessary, Don Lambert argued in his paper to the group, that I and you become (are) a 'native.' Others, myself included, felt that, while understanding was extremely important, explanation was only possible if firm ground outside the subjective system of the society being studied could be maintained, from which the analysis could be developed, in other words, if a theory in terms of which 'native' systems could be analysed and explained could be utilised (recognising that our own systems are also 'native' systems).

Having discussed, to some extent, what anthropology was and is, and what have been its central concerns from the point of view of its object (subject matter) and theoretical perspectives, the group then turned to the question of whether anthropology could be defined by its methods and techniques. If anthropology is indissolubly wedded to the study of 'primitive' society, then 'the end of anthropology' that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Peter Worsley foresaw in 1966 is at hand, for those societies are now, almost without exception, integrated into larger social systems, whether national or international. If, however, one decides that anthropology is characterised less by its object than by its method then it may be possible for a new, re-constituted anthropology to continue to survive and to provide us with understanding and explanation of social processes and social structures. As mentioned above, the characteristic method of athropology has been that of participant observation, which is as possible in western society (possibly even more so), as it was in other kinds of society. If that method is taken as defining anthropology it becomes possible to practise anthropology without leaving Britain, or Western Europe. And it is striking that, while the number of anthropologists working in Europe is now increasing rapidly no more than a small minority are calling themselves sociologists. So it would appear that anthropology is still managing to maintain itself as a distinct discipline, defined by its technique of participant observation and by its concern with small-scale, face-to-face social relations studied over a long period of time in the field.

It was noted that in the Conference even the professional anthropologists were unable or unwilling to define anthropology. This revealed a situation that, while confusing for others, nevertheless provides excellent opportunities for school teachers and others to exploit. Anthropology is not, should not be, a possession of a tight, ccherent group of specialists defending their possession — as it sometimes appeared to be at the Conference. Indeed, this is not possible, given the lack of consensus as to what it is they are protecting and defending. Professor Leach might not be an enthusiast for the spread of his kind of social science into the school curriculum (although, in fact, what he appears to be afraid of is the spread of a kind of anthropology that is not his kind of social science, as much as anything else, as far as can be judged from his extraordinary and inept lecture on 'anthropology and the school curriculum') but the schools do not have to choose between having this kind of social science or none at all — there **are** alternatives.

So there are different ideas, even among the professionals, as to what anthropology is, and there are even more interpretations of what it might be by non-professionals. Are there also different ideas about what it should be for — what is the aim of anthropology? The answer to this is, I believe, that there are. Certainly most will agree with Leach that the simplest aim is to reveal the variability and essential rationality of all kinds of human society but not all will agree that our discussion of various kinds of society should be carried on in a moral vacuum, in which all forms of society are equally 'good': a complete relativism. In my own view if anthropology remains **only** a way of showing how different and intrinsically valid and yet essentially similar all kinds of human society and culture are, believing simply that to know and to appreciate is to understand, explain and to be able to alter then the contribution of anthropology will be seriously

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

limited. This is where many of the earlier anthropologists were misguided. They were concerned to demonstrate the intrinsic value and worth of the tribal societies they studied, they were concerned to protect them and help them, they were concerned to argue the need for tolerance and understanding of these different kinds of society from our own — and yet they failed, almost to a man, to investigate and to reveal the mechanisms by which those tribal societies had been altered and even transformed by their integration into a wider society — colonial society. If anthropology is used only to show social and cultural differences as a basis for understanding, tolerance and self-criticism, then it has limited itself unduly, and failed to live up to one of its own self-avowed objectives — the wholistic study and analysis of society.

In other words, if anthropology remains concerned with other kinds of society only, and fails to confront the total pattern of social, economic and political relations of which those other kinds of society are now inextricably a part, then it is limiting itself to a partial analysis and an incomplete analysis. If it defines itself by the use of certain methods, then it cannot be a distinct discipline but a part of a wider study of society and societies: a part of a comparative sociology which tries to understand and explain the variation in forms of social life that exist and have existed, to understand and explain how they have changed and why.

The group discussed the use of anthropology as an education and the practicability of using anthropology in schools. It was widely felt that it was as important to understand our own society as to understand those of others; if this was true what had anthropology to offer that sociology did not? Was it something to do with the greater personal involvement in/with the place and people studied? At the moment anthropology was a subject to be taught and learned, largely from books written by other people who had undergone particular experiences and had achieved a certain understanding of the societies about which they wrote. Did anthropology have to be a subject learned vicariously through books? Was it not possible for school kids to become anthropologists themselves; to experience, to try to understand and explain events, processes that they saw around them? Surely it would be positive, and very much in the anthropological tradition to undertake some sort of limited fieldwork — in the form of projects and practical work? But was fieldwork not difficult? The professional anthropologists insisted on the crucial importance of fieldwork, both for the discipline and for the individual anthropologist; in the latter case as a sort of rite of passage into the fraternity. And what sort of projects anyway?

It was suggested that anthropology was in a sense a state of mind; that is, that it was a way of looking at society, a way of asking questions and a way of exploring the implications of social relations. If that were accepted, then one could start on the process of becom-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ing an anthropologist by beginning to think like one, beginning to ask questions like one and beginning to make the sorts of observations and draw the sorts of conclusions anthropologists do. Of course it was difficult, but anyone could start.

It was suggested that what was important was the problem one had in mind when asking questions: knowing what questions to ask and asking the 'right' questions was as important, more important, than finding the right answers — in fact the latter was not really possible without the former. Trying to solve real problems in the community might be one way of discovering the right sorts of questions to ask.

But in order to learn about the sorts of problems that existed, and the ways of asking questions, making observations and drawing conclusions, it was not sufficient just to get out into the world around one. There were things one could learn from others, from teachers and from professional anthropologists. Concepts, for example, and techniques.

But does anthropology have distinctive concepts of its own, concepts that sociology does not have?. In what ways does anthropology really differ from sociology ? One answer was that there was essentially no real or valid difference, that both were separate disciplines for historical reasons but that their body of theory and concepts as well as their techniques (by and large), coincided, or at least overlapped significantly. Another answer was that they were institutionally distinct in the universities and colleges and that this meant that they tended to talk different languages from each other. They were institutionally distinct because historically anthropology studied 'primitive' society and sociology studied 'advanced' western industrial, and 'communist' industrial societies and this division was still maintained within the colleges and universities. Because anthropology was considered less 'relevant' to the needs of our own society, and was essentially concerned with ' primitives,' it was considered less worthwhile teaching at school level. It was esoteric and difficult and more suitable to university level. This was questioned.

The fact however that anthropology questioned assumptions about accepted morals and values and demonstrated alternatives, and at the same time involved the anthropologist (or student) more personally in the alternative culture or society was felt to raise the question of the advisability of allowing children to become too involved in anthropological practice as opposed to book-learned anthropological theory. It was felt that this might lead to personal difficulties for the children. This feeling echoes that expressed by Leach in his paper. This question raises difficult issues related to the importance of personal security versus awareness of the society in which one lives at different ages. Some felt that it was dangerous and unfair to a child to reveal the full 'horrors and complexities' of modern class society while others felt that it was equally dangerous to allow the child to remain ignorant about the state of the world it

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

inhabited and thus to remain at a disadvantage in coping with its own social problems.

Whether anthropologists liked it or not anthropology was being taught in schools; whether as part of a geography course, a social studies course or as part of sociology and economics. The professional anthropologists were concerned that much of what was taught was naive and perhaps worse than nothing. The lives of people from other cultures and societies often appeared briefly in the textbooks as examples and illustrations — it was rare to find detailed and careful accounts of their total social life. In geography, at least, a sort of environmental determinism appeared to be common, especially when discussing the way in which the lives of other societies are affected by the climate and the physical geography. All too often they draw on out-of-date works in anthropology or upon works of questionable nature.

It was suggested that it was inevitable that, given the structure of secondary and higher education, the teaching of anthropology in schools and at universities was bound to be different. In the schools all teaching was affected by the need to help students to pass their exams, while at university this was less important. In the schools the distinction between disciplines appeared to be more rigid and it was therefore more difficult to achieve a broader, more comparative approach to the study of society, such as appeared to be offered by anthropology, although new, broader-based curricula was being introduced. The control exerted by the examination boards was deplored and it was felt strongly that teachers should have more control over the courses and the syllabuses they taught. Only if teachers themselves acquired a greater degree of control over what they taught would it be possible to alter the syllabuses sufficiently drastically to allow a real restructuring of disciplines and disciplinary boundaries and to enable anthropology to contribute fully to the study of society.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

This brief commentary on the discussions of the 'Critique' group is not written as an accurate report on what was discussed, a sort of official minutes. It constitutes one set of responses to the discussion, intended to raise its own set of comments and criticisms, as a contribution to what, I believe, should be a continuing discussion, rather than a final summary or reports. The response of another group member follows.

DAVID SEDDON.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITIQUE OF ANTHROPOLOGY

If one attempts a critique of anthropology one must surely make it in terms of the topic of this meeting. In many ways the types of questions asked of anthropologists during the course of this conference both by teachers and by other anthropologists in attendance point up some of the short-comings of anthropology as currently practised.

My first impression is that anthropologists are not exactly sure what it is they are doing, and, perhaps more importantly, why they are doing it. This was illustrated most sharply by the fact that key speakers and seminar participants alike, most of them practising professional anthropologists, were unable or unwilling to attempt a definition of the discipline. Again and again the question was asked, 'What is anthropology?' Implied in that question is the second question, 'Why anthropology?' Teachers want to know why they should include anthropology in the secondary school curriculum. They want to know what anthropology offers beyond what may already be offered by sociology, political science, economics. They are only partially satisfied by answers such as 'cultural relativism, understanding other cultures, etc.'

It has become apparent that in some strange way we professional anthropologists have become suprisingly smug in our feeling that anthropology needs no justification and is an end in itself, anthropology for anthropology's sake, anthropologist talking to anthropologists.

The old definitions of anthropology, descriptions of the unique qualities of anthropology — comparative perspective, participation observation, holistic perspective — are no longer sufficient. Other disciplines now use these methods and anthropologists now sometimes utilize methods traditionally associated with other disciplines — they now work in complex societies, urban societies, use statistics, projective techniques, etc.

Anthropologists seem confused about just what anthropology is and what it has to offer (more than comparative sociology). In my estimation this is a problem which is of greater magnitude in Britain than in America. British anthropology, though there are new trends entering it now, has to be typified, not unjustly, as cross-cultural sociology. For people trained in this tradition it may well be difficult to conceive of anthropology offering something more than, say, a sensitive and well done piece of sociologal research.

The problem would not be as great for an American anthropologist. American anthropology has a tradition of emphasising cultural aspects of anthropology as its unique contribution. American anthropology, with a stronger emphasis on the individual and his difficult integration into society, has emphasised communication and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

symbolism. Symbolism, cultural symbolism, is a man's hallmark in the eyes of the American anthropologist.

I would like to suggest that, without denigrating the contributions of social anthropology, it is the concept of culture that is the unique contribution which anthropology can make to the school curriculum. Briefly, the demonstration that the often apparently bizarre symbols, thought patterns and world views of the "others," the members of other cultures or sub-cultures, is logical and rational in the cultural context of that society and that it has an internal consistency, may not only produce some empathy in the minds of the students but may also lead them to attempt an examination of the "logical" or "cultural" principles which structure their own world view and influence their own behaviour.

It is my belief that anthropology justifies its own existence to the extent that it makes the "student" aware of the phenomena or paradigms which influence his behaviour, to the extent that "unconscious" motivations are made conscious and therefore subject to rational control. This is anthropology's brief.

I might add, parenthitically, that it is often possible to be objective about another world view where one cannot be objective about one's own culture. It is then to be hoped that the reflexive aspect of anthropological method of which Frankenberg spoke takes over and eventually leads to the greater understanding of one's own culture.

This leads directly to the second major critique of anthropology. Anthropologists forget that the aspect of this study of anthropology which is most successful in producing this type of awareness is not the endless reading of anthropological accounts of strange lifeways, but rather the field work experience, the encounter with viable, logical, consistant behaviour and thought patterns.

Nowhere in the university undegraduate curriculum is there any provision made for giving anthropology students, particularly those who will be attempting to teach anthropology in the secondary schools, the 'culture shock' experience, the total immersion in another world, that produces insights leading to cultural understanding. There is, as far as I know, no university which requires original 'live' research as part of their degree programme. It is hardly surprising then that although many anthropologists at this meeting felt that it would be valuable for secondary students to attempt some original fieldwork of a limited nature, they seemed to feel that it would be this might be carried out. They seemed to feel that it would be confusing or that it would be too difficult. In part this may be a reflection of the anthropologist's own difficulties. Several have commented on their own inadequate preparation for carrying out fieldwork, and the poor quality of the supervision and direction given them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although this may be unfair, I feel that this is a reflection of anthropologists' preoccupation with high-level theory, their introverted patterns of communication primarily with each other. They seem to need(and seek) little feedback from non-anthropologists concerning the pragmatic applications of their insights.

It may be that if the fieldwork tradition was introduced at the undergraduate level potential secondary teachers would not only have a better understanding of anthropology, but would be better able and more confident of their ability to teach anthropology and to supervise a limited type of fieldwork by their own students.

In conclusion then let me summarize by saying that many of the criticisms directed at anthropology, particularly in the context of this conference, could be answered if a stronger emphasis was placed by British anthropology on the cultural or symbolic aspects of human society.

Secondly, a stronger emphasis should be placed, both in the literature and in the training of anthropologists, on the problems of analyzing and understanding human behaviour. This is what social sciences are all about and the area in which anthropology, cultural anthropology, can make a strong contribution if the potential teachers are properly trained.

R. R. CLARK.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT FROM STUDY GROUP A: TEACHING ANTROPOLOGY

During its first session the group considered a paper *by Mr. Olding of Great Baddow Comprehensive School, describing the Mode III CSE anthropology syllabus he was teaching, and heard descriptions of the International Baccalaureate course run by Mr. Rowe at Atlantic College and of Liberal Studies course Miss Hurman had run at Durham Technical College.

Three main questions arose from the three discussion sessions which followed:

(a) why should we teach anthropology and what are our objectives?
(b) when should we teach anthropology?
(c) how should we teach anthropology?

The group came back to the first question time after time and achieved partial success in answering it. Some of the reasons put forward were:

(i) because it exists as a subject in its own right;
(ii) to foster understanding of other societies and reduce ethnocentrism;
(iii) to improve race relations and reduce stereotyping and prejudice;
(iv) to enable individuals to take a more knowledgeable and active role in their own societies.

It was thought that pupils and teachers may have differing aims, the former looking only to the short-term whilst the latter may be more concerned with the long-term aim of changing attitudes. There could, too, be some conflict between the anthropolgist's aim to create understanding and tolerance of differences between societies, and the aim of schools which was often to eradicate these differences. Anthropology and the other social sciences could offer a methodology and a critical assessment of evidence, and one of the most important things to teach children was how to find out information and how to evaluate that information. Dr. La Fontaine was asked which assumptions underpin first year undergraduate teaching. She felt that four points were essential; to prevent or eliminate the idea that ways of behaving or oganising society are "natural" or "instinctive," to make students aware of their own prejudices, to teach a critical perception of data and an appreciation of its limitations, and to relate facts to theory — there was a dangerous tendency for students to separate these two facets of their studies.

Answers to the question "when?" ranged from doubt about whether anthropology should be taught below first degree level and the Bruner hypothesis that "any subject can be taught effectively in

* A shortened version of this paper is included as an appendix to this report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development. His project "Man: A Course of Study" was designed to illustrate this and the Middle School Humanities Curriculum for 9-12 year-olds included a good deal of anthropological material and also used anthropological methods to enable the child to look at his own society. There was some discussion of the Schools Council Social Studies Curriculum project for the Middle Years of Schooling, which purports to examine certain "cradle to grave" concepts at a level suitable for 8-13 year olds (see Schools Council Working Paper No. 22, p.22). It was felt that terms such as "ideas" or "generalisations" could be used rather than "concepts" and many members criticised inaccuracies in some of the concepts being put over. It was pointed out that the University of Oxford eschews sub-degree level anthropology because it feels that one cannot study other societies in depth until one understands one's own. Members felt, however, that studying other societies should help students to look at their own with greater insight, but recognised the dangers of inducing shock and uncertainty in children who would be made aware of the differences existing within their own groups as well as between groups.

The question "how?" took up most of the group's time and raised many interesting points. It was pointed out that some semantic confusion existed over the word "anthropology" which, in Europe particularly tended to mean physical rather than social anthropology. There was some concern about the opinion expressed by one member that physical anthropology was to be "got out of the way" before passing on to a study of social anthropology and it was agreed that a certain amount of physical anthropology ought to be taught because it had a valuable part to play not only in helping us to understand ourselves, but also to correct misconceptions concerning race, heredity, and so on.

There was discussion as to whether anthropology should be taught "straight" with a special slot in the timetable, as Mr. Rowe of Atlantic College and Mr Olding of Great Baddow Comprehensive were teaching it, or included in other courses such as sociology or social studies. Members felt that an A Level course (and indeed any school level course) must not contain too much theoretical material; they were anxious that jargon should be avoided as much as possible — social scientists themselves did not always agree upon the meanings of certain terms and it would be misleading to teach pupils "universal definitions." One of the criticisms of Mr. Olding's CSE syllabus was that it was too conceptual and definition-centred, and this led to a discussion as to whether one should start with concepts and use concrete examples to illustrate them, or start with concrete examples and lead gently to an understanding of concepts. Many members were afraid that indiscriminate use of visual material could have the unintended effect of reinforcing cultural stereotypes and they felt that films, slides and so on should be used only with very careful preparation and follow-up. At the moment this was not always the case; material was often included piecemeal and often ill-digested afterwards.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion centred for some time upon the practical problem of the time lag between anthropological research and the publication of material which made it difficult for students to keep up to date; there was some danger that work on, for example, Eskimos could be 20 years out of date by the time it was used regularly in teaching. This led to long discussion of the problem of relating traditional anthropological material to the facts of social change; it was asked, for instance, how far contemporary political issues such as the position of Aborigines in Australian society today should be introduced into the teaching situation: in modern society an insistence upon treating other peoples with respect and understanding was considered to be a political issue in itself and the teacher was faced with the problem of finding that he may have to take a controversial stand. The group considered whether it would be wise to start from the point of view of culture, contact and change and look back to traditional ways of living, or to start with an account of traditional ways of life and work towards the contemporary situation as did, for example, the film of the Hadza, which mentioned at the end of the film the contemporary conditions of these people who were originally hunters and gatherers.

The group then went on to discuss the sort of approach it thought might be most useful in teaching anthropology in schools. It was suggested that a day in the life of . . ." approach might be used, including aspects of family life, technology, ritual and so on, but fears were expressed about the possibility of making simpler societies appear childlike (showing films of, for example, a primitive technology without any other information about the lives of the people could merely lead pupils to infer that because our technology was demonstrably superior our way of living was superior too). Some members favoured instead giving an all-round view of one society, which could be studied in depth.

A member pointed out that at Thomas Bennet Comprehensive School in Crawley all first year pupils followed an integrated course which linked social anthropology with some aspects of domestic economy (for example the preparation and cooking of food from many different parts of the world). This had proved very popular with the pupils and had been a useful way of introducing anthropological concepts).

Members went on to discuss the uses of language and the Whorf-Sapir hypothesis that the world is conceived in different ways by those whose languages are structured in different ways. Examples were given of the Nuer, who have many words to describe to colouring of their oxen, the Eskimos who have a large vocubulary to cover snow in its many states, and Hopi Indians who divide the world between long-term and short-term events. Anthropolgists in the group pointed out that no language can be said to be primitive — all are rich and complicated in different ways, and the full range of human emotions can be explored in any language. It was suggested that the study of language could be an important way into anthropology in the classroom. One member mentioned that he started his anthropological investigations with the word "uncle" which in our language is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

both a specific kinship term and a title of respect from children to some adults who are not kin. Another member explained how some of his 12-year-old pupils made up dictionaries of the words they used, to show how even in a small group there could be a considerable variety of vocabulary. This led to a discussion as to whether the teaching of anthropology should aim at showing differences or at indicating where similarities lay, and many members felt that it was more important to stress the latter. It was felt that using one's own classroom or peer group for anthropological study could lead to a dangerous intrusion into the privacy of the child and an assault upon his self-confidence; he could also be made very vulnerable to manipulation by the teacher.

It was suggested that, in order to reduce the connotative distortions associated with certain words, they should be made "taboo" in anthropological teaching: the words "primitive" and "modern" had emotive connotations; terms such as "black studies" and "ethnic studies" had racial undertones and the content of such studies often gave the erroneous impression that, for example, Africans and Indians were more like each other than either was like us; the word "tolerance" was thought to be value-laden — we "tolerate" naughty children or an unpleasant climate, for example, and should not be encouraged merely to "tolerate" non-industrial peoples. It was suggested that "Alternative Ways of Life" may be a suitable title for a course in anthropology.

The group finally asked how children could be encouraged to infer insights without the teacher labouring comparisons or asking direct questions and it was suggested that a topic such as food and diet may be a useful starting point:

> Diet is a good example of enduring custom — we eat in astonishingly similar ways within our population despite class differences (we don't eat predatory animals or insects in this country whoever we are; we eat our food in a uniform order—we do not, for example, ever end our meal with soup; we have fairly uniform ideas about what should go with what). It was suggested that the subject could be introduced visually to children by slides showing unacceptable combinations of food (for example a boiled egg served with chips) and this could lead to a discussion as to why we eat some things together and not others. It would be too simplistic to explain food behaviour in geographical terms only: the same vegetables grow in many different countries but are prepared and used in different ways for cultural reasons. One universal fact was that people everywhere are selective and only eat a proportion of the edible material which is available: sometimes this is because foodstuffs are prohibited for religious reasons, sometimes because some peoples do not consider what is in fact food to **be** food (for example dogs and earthworms are not considered to be food in this country), and sometimes food is reserved for special occasions or for special people (for example, a traditional Christmas dinner, or the roasting of a swan for the Royal Family). Food can be seen

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as an indicator of class or status differences — who eats with whom, and who is served when and by whom are strong indicators of social status. The formality of eating procedures, too, can be seen as universal: the way one holds one's knife and fork, or whether one uses only a fork on certain occasions are all social indicators and even where fingers are used instead of tools there are rules to be followed.

It was seen that a topic such as food could lead into other anthropological studies: food is used for special occasions, as a form of exchange, in religious ceremonies, as sacrifice, as a sign of hospitality; eating together marks some form of relationship, and eating habits are subject to change with influences from outside. Members noted that the Commonwealth Institute was hoping to launch a project on cooking and culture.

It was suggested that topics such as clothing, hygiene, or "what is considered valuable" could equally introduce anthropological concepts and lead into the study of religion, exchange, politics, social change, etc. Members of the group agreed that it would be most valuable to follow up their general discussions with some work on a project such as food and diet. They felt that there were many anthropological avenues to be explored (Mary Douglas, "Purity and Danger" was an obvious starting point) and that it would then be profitable to work on a series of tape slides and other visual aids and to attempt to build a course. Although Mr. Thorn (Technical Adviser to the RAI Teaching Resources Project) had shown some videotapes to the group to indicate what teachers could make for themselves there was a general feeling that teachers would rather make use of professionally produced materials and would appreciate most of all some guidance as to how they could be used. It was agreed that although the conference had provided plenty of information about resources for teaching anthropology, there was now a need for some practical demonstrations as to how these could be integrated into a course in order to lead children to make the sort of inferences the group felt to be desirable.*

At the end of the discussions Mr. Marks, the A Level examiner for the Associated Examining Board's Sociology syllabus, joined the group to answer questions. Mr. Marks felt that the AEB would welcome answers from candidates who made comparisons with other cultures but pointed out that it would be unwise to ignore all reference to modern Britain or other industrial societies. Although it was unlikely that there would be a separate A Level in anthropology for some years, the present sociology A Level was becoming less rigidly sociological and there were likely to be more anthropological questions and less emphasis on modern Britain.

* The RAI hopes to arrange a series of teachers' workshops, perhaps as weekend courses, at which themes could be developed and demonstration lessons given for criticism. A. Hurman

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions

The group's discussions could be summed up under the following headings:

1. It was felt that anthropology should be taught as part of an integrated course rather than as a separate subject and that physical anthropology must be included.

2. It was important to avoid the teaching of theory and the use of jargon.

3. Anthropological concepts could be introduced at almost any level in the school, but there was an urgent need for training for teachers in both content and method; unless taught very carefully visual and other material could merely serve to reinforce prejudices.

4. There were dangers in using the pupil's own peer group at below A Level for anthropological study, but the study of anthropology could and should lead to a greater understanding of oneself and one's own society.

5. Of the many possible approaches to a study of anthropology it would be most profitable to start with a topic such as "a day in the life of . . . ," language, the study of a whole society in depth, or a theme such as food and diet, clothing, hygiene or what is considered valuable, and lead from there to an inference of concepts. It was important to link the study of anthropological material to contemporary social situations.

6. Certain words such as "primitive," "modern," "black studies," and "tolerance" should be banned from the vocabulary of those studying anthropology in school.

7. The group felt that they had ignored a very crucial issue throughout their discussions: that of teaching in a multi-racial school. It was felt that much more consideration ought to have been given to this and that there was much need for further work on introducing anthropological perspectives in a multi-racial society.

ANN HURMAN

PAULINE STRIVENS

JEREMY ROWE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PAPER PRESENTED TO STUDY GROUP A BY D. OLDING, GREAT BADDOW COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL, CHELMSFORD

In the context of racial harmony I consider it necessary that the myth of "primitive" people and "primitive" language be eradicated. The only use of the word with reference to non-literate peoples is with respect to "primitive technology"; it must not be assumed that a transition from a non-literate society to one of literacy is inevitable on evolutionary lines.

Anthropological source material may initially enhance racial prejudice but this adds challenge to the exciting classroom atmosphere of overcoming this prejudice to bring a sense of reason. There are well defined cases of this in my own school. At the end of the course I consider that I have failed if any of my students still believes that there is a primitive person, race or language.

If the study of society is to be attractive to the less able, in my judgement the motivating 'exotica' of anthropology as a separate subject must be employed. For the more able students at 'O' and 'A' level there is little or no need for such a motivation and, although I have an open mind on the subject, I am presently inclined to agree with the Schools' Council's attitude that anthropology best comes within a comparative societies scheme. It would seem that the new A.E.B. 'A' level Sociology syllabus gives scope for 'straight' anthropological teaching. There are sufficient questions not mentioning 'sociology' or 'Britain' for a completely or partly 'straight' anthropological approach to the whole examination.

The Cambridge Syndicate and the E.A.E.B. for the C.S.E. are at the moment working together on a comparative societies (non-literate/literate) course for the full range of examinable 16-plus candidates. The Cambridge Syndicate is working on a similar comparative course at 'A' level. All these moves coincide with my belief that the aim of anthropology teaching is as quoted in the Mode 3 C.S.E. syllabus attached:- "The object is to help the student to understand that there are whole scales of values, ordinary concepts and ideas of what is rational, that are entirely different from his own and that with them there have been viable social and economic systems." This helps a student to understand that there are right and proper facets in other societies which are necessary for the maintenance of their institutions, in the same way that there are **different** right and proper facets in **his** society which are necessary for the maintenance of the institutions with which **he** is familiar. This does not imply that a student is obliged to accept that institutions in any society should not be allowed to change. I believe that none of this prejudices a student's chances of coming to terms with the moral codes of his own society, and could possibly **enhance** his chances of so doing.

I do not teach that schools are unnecessary. It seems to be a reasonable proposition that schools were not necessary for the main-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tenance of the social and economic order in non-literate societies before large scale acculturation from Europeans, but that schools appear to have at least some role in the continuance of our social and economic system. In any case, students will make their own conclusions about this.

No social science course can be taught entirely as a 'straight' single discipline subject. You will see that the Mode 3 scheme attached has some comparative work with U.K. society. But to re-iterate, my judgement is that for the less able the attraction should be the 'exotic non-literate.'

A County Audio-Visual aids department provides the following services:

(a) A slide can be made, in colour or black and white, of any material, blown up or reduced, at a cost of 5p. The slide is in a rigid plastic container, with transparent rigid crystal clear plastic covering, back and front.

(b) 40 minutes of sound film can be videotaped in black and white at a cost of £8.

Forty minutes of B.B.C. videotaped material costing the £8 can be kept for one year with a general permission by the B.B.C., at no cost. I imagine that the B.B.C. will consider an application for a retention of a longer period.

Twenty minutes of 16mm. sound film can be copied as 8mm. sound film at a commercial price of £8 per copy plus £75 irrespective of the number of copies of one film taken.

I can understand the reticence of teachers not familiar with anthropological material, if asked to teach anthropology. I give my C.S.E. students a skeleton body of notes for the whole course in language of "Grade 4 complexity." The more able translate this on their own initiative into language of their own standard.

I believe that my course encourages pupils to go to serious anthropological works rather than to the mythical glossy 'Heyerdahl-type' presentations.

Part of the course aims to eliminate the fallacy that man is descended from apes; a simplified account of the biological evolution of man emphasises his immensely remote common ancestry with other primates.

I would like to see the attached syllabus be used as a basis for a Mode 2 or Mode 3 proposal to be submitted similarly to all the C.S.E. Boards. I would be very pleased to hear from anyone prepared to work with me on this.

In the attached Mode 3 syllabus 35 marks are awarded for Paper I, 40% for paper II 20% for any anthropological topic and 5% for the teacher's cumulative judgement of work throughout the course.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GREAT BADDOW COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL
ANTHROPOLOGY SYLLABUS C.S.E. MODE 3

1. **Classification of the Anthropological Sciences:** Social Anthropology, Physical Anthropology, Ethnology, Archaeology, Ethnography, Cultural Anthropology and Primitive Technology.

2. **Patterns of Society**
   (a) Simple social and economic systems.
   (b) More complex hunting and food-gathering systems.
   (c) Agriculture with a small surplus.
   (d) Complex agricultural and pastoral systems.

3. **Race and Culture**
   Miscegnation. The myth of superior races. Explanation of cultural differences.

   The following sections: 4, 5, 6 and 7 are the study of the structure and institutions of non-literate societies and of the inter-relationships and roles of individuals within social groups. The object is to help the student to understand that there are whole scales of values, ordinary concepts and ideas of what is rational, that are totally different from his own, and that with them there have been viable social and economic systems.
   A comparison with United Kingdom society should be made where possible.

4. **Marriage, Family, Lineage and Clan**
   Genealogy tables. Definition of marriage. Individual family. Extended family. Consanguineous kin. Affinal kin. Classificatory and descriptive kinship terms. Rights and obligations of kinship. Monogamy, Polygamy. Polygyny. Polyandry. "Group Marriage." Concubinage. Cicisbeism. Levirate and Sororate. Patrilocal and Matrilocal residence. Lobola or "bride-price." Preferential marriage. Exogamy. Endogamy. Incest. Marriage ceremonies and divorce. Rules of descent, succession and inheritance. Unilateral and cognate lineages and clans.

5. **Non-lineage groupings, Caste and Class**

6. **Political Organisation and Law**
   Segmented and Stratified societies. Forces of social control, other than legal institutions, with particular reference to segmented societies.

7. **Magic and Religion**
   Frazer's distinction between magic and religion. Witchcraft. Witch-doctors, Sorcery. Medicine Men. Shamans, Priests, Headtaking and Cannibalism. Functions of magic and religion.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. **Acculturation**

9. **Theories of Culture**
Evolution. Diffusion. Origin of the Polynesians.

10. **Biological Evolution of Man in outline**
Mechanism of biological evolution. Unspecialised monkey like primate, the common ancestor of Pongids and Hominhids, Propliopithecus, Ramapithecus, Australopithecus, Homo erectus, Homo sapiens. Existence of the remains of intermediate types supporting the theory that evolution consists of a series of virtuaally imperceptible changes totalling a species change. The round teeth arcade and small canines in Hominids compared with the rectangular arcade and large canines of Pongids.

EAST ANGLIAN EXAMINATIONS BOARD

for the

Certificate of Secondary Education

Great Beddow Comprehensive School, Chelmsford

MODE 3

ANTHROPOLOGY

PAPER I

....., May, 19.....

Centre No. ..... Time Allowed: 1½ Hours
(to)

Candidate's No. .....

Candidate's Name .....

Show that you understand the meaning of each of the following by writing in the space provided.

1. Marriage
2. Individual Family
3. Extended Family
4. Consanguineous Kin
5. Affinal Kin
6. Monogamy
7. Polygamy
8. Polygyny
9. Polyandry
10. "Group Marriage"
11. Concubinage
12. Cicisbeism
13. Patrilocal residence
14. Matrilocal residence
15. Classificatory kinship term

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

16. Descriptive kinship term
17. Exogamy
18. Endogamy
19. Incest
20. Lobola
21. Preferential marriage
22. Levirate
23. Sororate
24. Patrilineage
25. Matrilineage
26. Cognate lineage
27. Clan
28. Age-set
29. Caste
30. Class
31. Sorcery
32. Medicine Men
33. Witch Doctor
34. Shaman
35. Priest

EAST ANGLIAN EXAMINATIONS BOARD
for the
Certificate of Secondary Education
Great Baddow Comprehensive School, Chelmsford

MODE 3

ANTHROPOLOGY

PAPER II

....., May, 19

Time Allowed 2 hours
(to)

Answer any FIVE questions on the writing paper provided.

1. Draw up a classification of the Anthropological Sciences. Show clearly what you understand by each branch.
2. What is meant by witchcraft? Describe beliefs of any one non-literate society. Compare the anthropologist's concept of witchcraft with what is called witchcraft in Britain.
3. Why do British and American anthropologists disagree with Heyerdahl's theories of the American origin of the Polynesians?
4. (a) How did Frazer distinguish between magic and religion?
   (b) Do all anthropologists accept his idea?
   (c) What are the functions of magic and religion?
   (d) Briefly compare the beliefs of any one non-literate society with religious beliefs in Britain.
5. Choose any ONE non-literate society and describe marriage, the family organisation and the clans in that society.

(604)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. Construct an imaginary genealogy table. In it use the representations for (a) Male, (b) Female, (c) Marriage, (d) Descent. Also use the personal name of (e) at least one male, (f) at least one female. Insert Ego and specify the relationship of (g) at least one individual to her/him. (h) Use the conventional way of showing a dead person.
7. Choose any ONE non-literate society and describe what it has accultured. Can you say anything about acculturation in the United Kingdom?
8. Describe FOUR kinds of economic organisation amongst non-literate peoples. What features seem to go with increasing complexities of such organisation?
9. What is meant by miscegnation ? How can differences between societies in levels of technology be explained? Comment on the ignorant attitude of some Caucasoids towards the physical characteristics of non-Caucasoid people.
10. Compare the ways in which society is controlled in (a) Britain and (b) Segmented societies.
11. What is meant by (a) A nucleic acid? (b) a species? Describe in outline, the steps in the biological evolution of man.

EAST ANGLIAN EXAMINATIONS BOARD
for the
Certificate of Secondary Education
Great Baddow Comprehensive School - Chelmsford

MODE 3

ANTHROPOLOGY

MARK SCHEME

PAPER I 1 mark for each answer. Total 35

PAPER II

Points of equal merit to those mentioned below will, of course, be awarded equal credit.

1. Widest meaning of Anthropology (1) Usual meaning (1), (1) for relationship and (1) for description for each of Social Anthropology, Physical Anthropology, Ethnology, Ethnography, Archaeology, Cultural Anthropology and Primitive Technology.
   Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

2. Meaning of Witchcraft (2). Probably Azande will be chosen. Mechanism of Witchcraft (2). Not every misfortune is so explicable (2). Operation of Oracle (3). Infallability of ruler's oracle (2). Witchdoctoring (3). Witchcraft in Britain would probably be called sorcery or religion (2).
   Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. One mark for each of 8 of the following points: Tacking possible in Polynesian canoe. Overlooked trade winds frequently reverse for long periods. No mention of counter-equatorial current. Gives linguistic evidence (suspect) for American origin of the sweet potato. Only 2 of the Marquesans whose blood was sampled by Heyerdahl were full blooded Polynesians. Universality of marking summer and winter solstices. Says erroneously that Polynesian languages are only remotely related to Malay. Kon-Tiki is a type of raft developed by the Peruvians after the Spaniards brought the use of the sail to them. Easter Island sculpture frauds. Sudden confusing appearance of Caucasoids in Heyerdahl's theories. Disagreement with his archaeological dating. Claimed Peruvian settlers of Easter Island made beautiful pottery but no pottery has been excavated there. The technique of building fitted masonry walls is found in Easter Island but does not appear in Peru until approximately A.D. 1500.

4. (a) (2). (b) No! Maintain distinctions not possible and/or useful and describe all belief and ritual as magico-religious (2). (c) To provide psychological safeguards against failure (2). Methods of attempting to control the uncontrollable (2). Expressions of collective optmism (2). Explanations of failure and disaster (2). Ways of securing and enforcing co-operation (2). (d) Brief description (2).
Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

5. Probably Toda will be chosen.
2 endogamous divisions (2). Tarthar division has 12 clans (exogamous) (2) and Teivali division 6 (2). Child belong to clan of social father (1). Establishment of social paternity (1). Family is wife, husband and group of social children (1). Marriage sometimes starts at the age of 2 (1). Description of Marriage Ceremony (4). Monogamy not uncommon (1). Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8. Polygyny is known (1).

6. 1 each for (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h).

7. Probably Ainu. (1) each for cultviation of millet, bathing, laughing, steel, pottery by wooden utensils made by steel knife, Japanese influence on clothing, infanticide now illegal, Shintoism, loss of tattoos, unpainted wooden buildings. Acculturation in Britain (6).
Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

8. (1) each for the following: (a) Simple Economic Systems. (b) More complex hunting and food-gathering systems. (c) Agriculture with a small surplus. (d) Complex agricultural and pastoral systems. (a) Bare existence. No private ownership of territory. No inequalities in ownership of wealth. (b) Chief

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

receives larger share of the products. Some trading. May be distinction between work and non-productive activities. (c) Although plots are run by families, control and assignment remain with the community. Produce kept by family and shared only in time of community need. Individuals released for specialised work. (d) Strategic resources privately owned. Villages begin to specialise. Groups of villages united for defence.

Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

9. Miscegnation — act of interbreeding between different races (2) Major factor in explaining cultural differences is the experience which each people has undergone (2). Vast changes have occurred that have not been connected in any way with changes in racial type. (2) e.g. efficient organisers of Roman Empire into 19th Century Italians and then into the efficient organisers within the common market (2). Although the skull of Australoids has more similarities with Homo erectus, the brain is as developed as in other races of Homo sapiens (1). Ignorant people point to the larger jaws (1), wide nose (1) and black skin of negroes as ape-like, (1) forgetting that non-negroid people have straight hair like apes and thin lips like apes (2). that some apes have white skin (1) and that Caucasoids have more hair than negroids (1).

Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

10. Britain: Centralised authority (1), Complex mechanism of administration (1), Legal Institutions (2), Material power of courts comes into play (2) when other forces of social conformity (also found in segmented societies) fail (1).

Segmented societies: Public opinion, everybody knows most of everybody's else's business, Positive sanctions, Negative sanctions, reciprocity principle, beliefs in effects of breach of taboo, beliefs in drastic consequences of the anger of ancestors or other supernatural beings, beliefs in the power of sorcery which restrain individuals from doing injury to others through fear of magical retaliation, not all of these non-legal forces operative in Britain: all 1 mark each.

Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

11. (a) Nucleic Acid (1), Species (1). One mark each of the following briefly described: Common ancestor of Pongids and Hominids, Propliopithecus, Ramapithecus, Australopithecus, Homo erectus, Homo sapiens, neanderthalis, significance of intermediate types. Speech? and Tool-making? in Australopithecus and H. erectus (3). Receding brow ridges, brain shape and size change and shrinking jaw in change from H. erectus to H. sapiens (4)

Total 16. Divide by 2 = 8.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C.S.E. GROUP REPORT

1. Introduction

The first problem which the group faced was a definitional one. Before we could decide what it could offer social science at this level, we had to determine the nature of Anthropology. During this process two important points were made.

(i) Essentially, Anthropology is a body of techniques for collecting and evaluating data and is applicable across the range of cultural diversity. It was felt that these techniques (i.e. Anthropology per se) may be too complex to convey at this level.

(ii) Anthropology and anthropological material must not be regarded as a panacea for either Education's or Society's ills.

It was decided to explore how Anthropology could be used as a resource base providing:

(i) direct stimulus materials for student use, e.g. ethnographic films, selections from monographs, photoplays, exhibitions.

(ii) material on different cultures for dissemination by teachers. These would be primarily textual.

(iii) a source of stimulating ideas for teaching stategies and classroom techniques derived from anthropological perspectives and literature.

Clearly we were in no position to refashion completely any existing C.S.E. syllabuses. However, we could explore how certain modules involving anthropological material might be composed. Sections 2 and 3 outline these. Section 4 consists of some anthropological resources which might be relevant to them.

2. Communication

Aims. (i) to raise as problematic a taken-for-granted feature of every day life.

(ii) to relate communication (and especially language) to cultural process.

(iii) to use anthropological data as an extension to the experiences of the students themselves.

Strategy: The module would be contructed around certain key questions.

(i) What is involved in communicating?

(a) The actual physical problems in communicating could be highlighted in several complementary ways e.g. asking the students to think of and pass a message and to ensure that it has been understood. Alternative forms may be derived

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from other cultures and the previous exercise repeated. Both these would raise the problems of encoding, transmission and decoding.

(b) The sharing of symbols could be discussed as an introduction to the nature of culture as a symbolic universe which is constructed, shared and learned. Direct examples could be drawn from the monographs listed in section 4.

(ii) How is communication structured?

(a) The nature of various communication media could be discussed with reference to speech, song, dance, writing, painting, mass media. Films such as 'Navaho Sand Painting (available from R.A.I.) would be relevant.

(b) The question of appropriateness of media could now be raised. Material on ritual (Family of Man: Death. B.B.C. Enterprises), role playing, writing, mapping and experiments of this sort could be used. The obvious concomitent of this would be a discussion of contexts, e.g. 'How to Ask for a Drink' C. O. Frake (cf section 4).

(c) Who communicates with whom? What relationships are involved? Here anthropological material on kinship systems, joking relationships, outgroup and ingroups would be essential.

(d) Forms of language. Actual examples of jargon, legal terminology, etc., should be readily available.

(e) Language as a problem. Material on language structures, vocabularies and the relative importance of language in other societies.

(iii) The relationship between thought, language and society.

(a) The different stress given to different types and contexts. This would be linked to (e) above.

(b) Culture as communication. Socialisation and culture. Language and social control. Numeracy, conceptualisation, language, dress, mime, myths, etc, as expressions of different ways of life. There is a wealth of anthropological and ethnographic material available, e.g. Dirt (film available from R.A.I.) and Cassirer, 'Language and Myth' (cf section 4).

3. Religion

(i) Broad areas to be approached:

(a) do all people have religion? What is it that they have in common?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) are there any universal similarities despite the vast cultural diversity?

(c) if religion is universal what does it "do for" us as humans?

(d) if it is not universal what does religion "do for" particular cultures?

(e) are some cultures more structured by religion than others? What explanation can be offered for this?

(ii) possible approaches:

(a) a tape slide presentation as an impact lesson presenting the wide variety of religions and their characteristics, e g. church; sect; gods; attributes of deities; festivals, etc.

(b) comparison of the major world religions.

(c) a detailed study of the religion of another culture to illustrate its complexity.

(d) idolism, similarities in the attitudes of people towards secular and religious figures—e.g., Mao, Donny Osmond, Christ, Charlie George.

(iii) Discussion

During the discussions which the group had on the above suggestions, several modifications were offered.

(a) It might be better to avoid the search for an adequate definition at the beginning but rather concentrate the tape/slide presentation on an aspect of religion, e.g., worship. The whole of the course will inevitably be about definitions of religion.

(b) The group wanted to avoid crude, naive functionalism in dealing with what religion "does for" people. It was thought that a discussion of the relationships between religion and power and authority would be important.

(c) It was felt that the relationship between culture and the forms and type of religion needed to be discussed. This could be achieved either through cross cultural comparisons or by tracing the changes in one religion over time and relating them to changes in the surrounding culture.

(d) A cross cultural comparison of ritual in social relationships could be useful. One illustrative topic might be death. Here the B.B.C. film, Family of Man: Death (B.B.C. Enterprises) might be useful. The group was at pains to point out that not all societies rely on religion and ritual to the same extent in life crises. One area of speculation would

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be whether some peoples experience more disorientation at life crises than others and whether this is related to the importance of religion and prevalence of ritual in social relationships.

(e) The individual life cycle and religion, does religion provide answers to otherwise unanswerable questions, e.g. what happens when we die? Do different religions define and undertake to solve different problems in different societies? Some of these issues could be approached by means of cross cultural comparison of festivals. There is a range of ethnographic and documentary film available.

(f) Once some of the preliminary work has been covered, it was suggested that the students might try to construct their own religion. This would raise interesting questions such as: What would the character of the religion be? What would be included and excluded? What would the ritual forms be and why? Extracts from William Golding's 'Lord of the Flies' might be used as stimulus material. (For other references cf. section 4).

(g) The main reservation felt about looking at the processes of deification and idolism, was that it should avoid conveying the impression that all religion was mass hysteria.

Throughout its discussions of both the modules set out above, the group felt that it should not specify too much detail so that teaching flexibility would be ensured.

MEL CROSS
BOB ANDERSON

4. RESOURCES

Language and Society: Methods and Sources for Study

The following notes are designed to suggest possible themes and sources for the study of language in society and society through language.

Communication is the leading theme. The syllabus suggestions are based on those of a successful course in the Sociology of Communications and the Mass Media run in 1972 for first year graphics and fine arts students at a Regional College of Art.

1. The Ethnography of Communication

a. The concept of "Communication": Indication systems: the physical means of passing messages. The problem of the relationship between the sender and the receiver of messages. The sharing of symbols and meanings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. Speech:	What dictates what how we say to whom in which situations? Contexts and situations. The words we use. Meaning and change of meaning.
c. The other aspects of Communicative situations:	Greetings Dress and Fashion Etiquette Gesture Mood Expectations Art
d. Systems of Classification:	Other languages Maps in our society and in others Classification of the universe — what is important (e.g. the Eskimo words for 'snow')
e. Writing Systems:	Ours; Chinese; Pictograms; Ancient Egyptian. Symbols in mathematics and the sciences Literacy and its consequences.

2. The Mass Media

a. Mass Society and its relations with Mass Media. Popular Literacy.
b. Newspapers and magazines. Ownership, organisation of the industry; the news and its reportage. Newspapers and the influence of taste, spread of information. Content analysis of newspapers and magazines. Opinion leadership, and social control. The press and dictatorship.
c. The Film. The film industry, its structure and organisation. The film and society. The contents of films, the structure of the industry and influences upon the audience.
d. Television. The organisation of the industry. Kinds of programme. Content analysis. Technical limitations and the problem of true reportage and representation, T.V. and the audience. T.V. and opinion change. The notion of a "grammar" of the screen.
e. Radio. Its content and communicative role.
f. Advertising. Its nature, role and social context.
g. Propaganda. The Mass Media and social control.
h. Censorship. Economic, political, legal and ethical considerations.
i. The Social Psychology of Social Communications.

3. Special Topics

Communication in Cities
Communication in Organisations.
Communication and Music
Design: fashion, furniture, architecture.
Communication and the Theatre and the Dance.
Problems of translation.
The Concept of "Style" in language and art.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Animal "languages."
Oral Traditions.
International languages, artificial languages and language reform.
Linguistic nationalism and colonialism.
Iconography and the study of Symbolic Systems.
The symbolic systems of the Natural Sciences.
Chomsky and the linguistic 'universals' of communication.
Systems of Notations: a comparative analysis.

Sources: Select List
(* available in paperback)

a. The most easily accessible source of material is the volume **Language and Social Context,** ed. by P. P. Gigioli, Penguin: Modern Sociology Readings, 1972.*
This book contains, in addition to a useful introduction, some general papers on the Sociology of Language, and some on the relationships between language and social structures, four papers of particular anthropological interest, as follows:
D. Hymes, **Towards Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events.**
E. Goffman, **The Neglected Situation.**
K. H. Basso, "To Give up Words": **Silence in Western Apache Culture.**
C. O. Frake, **How to Ask for a Drink in Subanun.**

b. **General and Collected Works.**
E. Sapir, **Language,** Rupert Hart-Davis (N.d.).*
S. Potter, **Language in the Modern World,** Penguin, 1964.*
J. Fishman (ed.), **Readings in the Sociology of Language,** Mouton 1968.
D. Hymes (ed.), **Language in Culture and Society,** Harper and Row, 1964.

c. **Language and Social Class and Stratification.**
B. Bernstein, **Class, Codes and Control,** Vol. I, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
B. Bernstein, 'A Socio-Linguistic Approach to Social Learning' in **Penguin Survey of the Social Sciences,** ed. J. Gould, 1965.*
B. Bernstein, 'Social Class, Language and Socialization,' in Giglioli volume. (This only represents a selection of Bernstein's work).
F. Williams (ed.) **Language and Poverty,** Markham, 1970.

d. **Lexical Change and Usage.**
S. Ullmann, **Words and their Use,** F. Muller, 1963.
J. A. Sheard, **The Words We Use,** Andre Deutsch, 1962.

e. **Literacy and Related Issues**
C. M. Cipolla, **Literacy and Development in the West,** Penguin, 1969.*
R. Hoggart, **The Uses of Literacy,** Penguin, 1962.*
M. McLuhan, **The Gutenberg Galaxy,** Routledge, 1967.*
M. McLuhan, **The Medium is the Message,** Penguin, 1967.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J. Miller, **McLuhan,** Fontana, 1971.*
G. E. Stearn, **McLuhan Hot and Cool,** Penguin, 1968.*

f. **Mass Communications**
R. Williams, **Communications,** Penguin, 1971.*

g. **Anthropological Themes**
B. Malinowski, **Coral Gardens and their Magic.** Vol. II
J. Vansina, **Oral Tradition,** 1969.
R. Finnegan, **Oral Literature in Africa.**
C. M. Bowra, **Primitive Song,** Mentor, 1963.*
E. Cassirer, **Language and Myth,** 1953, Dover Books.*

h. **Non-Linguistic Communication**
Sebeok (ed.), **Approaches to Semiotics,** Mouton.
E. T. Hall, **The Silent Language,** Doubleday, 1959.
MacDonald Critchley. **The Language of Gesture.**

i. **Advertising and Propaganda**
V. Packard, **The Hidden Persuaders,** Penguin, 1963.*
L. W. Doob, **Public Opinion and Propaganda,** 1948.

j. **Systems of Classification**
C. Levi-Strauss,**The Savage Mind,** Part I, Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
E. Durkheim and M. Mauss, **Primitive Classification,** 1963.

All the above works contain further references, and many contain extensive bibliographies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOURCES IN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY OF RELIGION

1. Introductory Notes

Anthropological approaches to the study of religion are generally concerned to a limited degree with points of doctrine and not at all with judgements about the "truth" of other religious beliefs, but with the examination of "religious culture": the social context of religious beliefs, the way these relate to social structure and organisation and the place of religion within the general 'culture' of the people concerned. For educational purposes this enables an approach to be made to other religious traditions by way of a study of certain kinds of **behaviour** and their social consequences. The emphasis of much anthropological writing on aspects of religious behaviour such as ritual, "rites de passage," festivities, the manufacture and manipulation of symbols, and observance relating to such things as dress, the making of noise and the eating or not eating of particular substances, does not commit the teacher to the making of judgements about the 'truth' of other (or indeed any) religions or to even prescribing what is to be included within the category of the 'religious,' which is itself a fascinating field to explore. At the same time the teacher is encouraged to make explicit the relationships between religion and social organisation, without this, however, forcing him into any crude functionalist position.

2. Sources

NOTE: Most of the material that follows is intended to represent a body of resources which may be flexibly exploited by the teacher. Very little can be used directly by pupils without considerable editing and commentary. Wherever possible easily available paperback editions have been denoted by an asterisk.

a. **Classic Monographs**

E. Durkheim, **The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life** (numerous editions).
E. E. Evans-Pritchard, **Neur Religion,** Oxford U.P., 1956.
E. E. Evans-Pritchard, **Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande,** O.U.P. *
G. Lienhardt, **Divinity and Experience: The Religion of the Dinka,** O.U.P., 1961.
F. Steiner, **Taboo,** Penguin, 1967. *
C. Geertz, **The Religion of Java,** Dover Bks, 1960.*
D. Aberle, **The Peyote Religion Among the Navaho,** Aldine, 1966.

b. **Useful general and collected sources.**

P. and M. J. Meggitt (eds.), **Gods, Ghosts and Men in Melanesia,** O.U.P., 1965.
J. Middleton (ed.), **Myth and Cosmos, Readings in Mytholog, and Symbolism.***
J. Middleton (ed.), **Magic, Witchcraft and Curing.** *
Both in the American Museum Source Books in Anthropology, New York, 1967.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

M. Banton (ed.), **Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion** *
Tavistock: A.S.A. Monographs. Contains useful papers on problems of defining religion.

M. Weber, **The Sociology of Religion**, Social Science Paperbacks, 1966.*

R. Robertson, **The Sociology of Religion,** Penguin, 1968.*

c. **Valuable works for more specific topics**

A. Van Gennep, **The Rites of Passage.**
Deals with transition rites and initiations.

V. Turner, **The Ritual Process,** Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1969.
The second half of this work is a stimulating attempt to examine certain kinds of rituals in western and complex Oriental societies with a view to elucidating certain general features of ritualistic and anti-ritualistic behaviour.

A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "The Sociological Theory of Totemism" in **Structure and Function in Primitive Society,** Cohen and West, 1968.*
A dated, but useful discussion of totemism, i.e., the complex relationships between men and social groups and certain categories of (usually) natural species or objects.

M. Douglas, **Purity and Danger,** Penguin, 1970.*
A stimulating discussion of concepts of pollution, cleanliness and taboo and of associated behaviour.

M. Douglas, **Natural Symbols,** Penguin, 1973.*
A study in ritual and symbolism and their implications.

A. C. Bouquet, **Comparative Religion,** Penguin, 1962.*

V. Lanternari, **The Religions of the Oppressed.***

P. Worsley, **The Trumpet Shall Sound,** Paladin, 1970.*
Two valuable studies of 'cargo-cults' ond other 'nativistic' religious activities.

Two more 'marginal' works, but which raise problems of the greatest interest are:

A. Watts, **The Way of Zen,** Penguin, 1965.*

C. Castaneda, **The Teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui Way of Knowledge** Penguin, 1972.*

J. R. CLAMMER.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTHROPOLOGY FOR THE CLASSROOM
'O' LEVEL GROUP REPORT

This report is necessarily a compromise in so far that a number of different interests were represented in the group: school and F.E., different levels of ability and time allocations for the course. We tried as far as possible to provide a basic framework which could be expanded or reduced where suggested.

The first discussion centred on the reasons for having anthropological material, and whether such material should be used illustratively or as a central theme for a cross-cultural course. The group felt that a full exploration of the latter would have proved to be a more fruitful exercise, but decided against this in view of the time available for discussion. Possible thematic approaches were suggested for an anthropology based course and these are included in an appendix to this main report.

The use of anthropological material in the teaching of 'O' level Sociology was felt to be essential for the following reasons:

1. Comparative material would encourage students to examine in a more objective way, aspects of their own society, which they would otherwise tend to take for granted.
2. It discourages an ethnocentric view of society.
3. Motivation.

Some notes of caution on the use of anthropological material were raised at this point.

a) Over-simplification of otherwise complex pre-industrial societies should be avoided.

b) Material must be carefully selected and introduced so that the 'primitive savage' view is not reinforced in the minds of students.

c) Material from too wide a range of societies would encourage superficiality, while the use of material from only one other society was too limiting and in some teaching situations might even reinforce existing prejudices. It was felt that examples should be taken from:

Hunting/gathering societies
Nomadic/pastoral societies
Peasant societies.

Two areas of the existing A.E.B. syllabus together with an introduction for the course were chosen for a detailed examination, the family and social control.

The Nature of Man

Two key ideas were to be stressed here:
Human behaviour is largely learned.
Man is a social animal.

The brief study of two or three other societies would serve as a useful introduction to the whole 'O' level course and would provide some background experience for students in the use of anthropological material. The depth and length of this introduction would depend on the particular situation of each teacher.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Examples of societies and resources which could be looked at:

1. **Aborigines.**

   Film: Desert people, Tjurunga. (Available from R.A.I.)
   Exhibits in the Museum of Mankind, Horniman Museum for those in the London area.
   Poster material from the Commonwealth Institute.

2. **Tonga.**

   Film: Village Life in Tonga. Useful as there is no commentary. (Vis News Productions).
   Back-up material on Polynesia in general from Commonwealth Institute, and in:
   'Habitat, Economy and Society.' C. Daryll Forde. Methuen.
   'Argonauts of the Western Pacific.' Malinowski. (Especially for the illustrations which might be reproduced).

3. **Hausa People.**

   Film: Hausa Village (from R.A.I.) — excellent on family organisation, marriage ritual, etc.
   'Baba of Caro' — an account by a Hausa woman of life in her village.

4. **The Ashanti.**

   'The Ochre People' Noni Jabavu.

Discussion based on these introductory studies should briefly examine:
Family structure, kinship.
Socialisation. (for 1 year course people).
Economic systems, division of labour.
Authority, power, decision making.
Belief systems.
Communications and language.
Technology (for those wanting greater depth).

The introductory course will itself lead into a detailed examination of the family. The danger of over-generalising about the nature of the family in either cross-cultural terms or within our own society was emphasised. Although we were aware of the accusation of teaching naive functionalism, the group felt that it provided an appropriate way of dealing with the family at this level. Definitions of the nature of families in cross-cultural terms are highly suspect and should be avoided.

Types of Family — extended, nuclear, joint, with and without common residence. Kibbutzim.

It was felt that the societies mentioned above provide a sufficient variety to illustrate the range of experiences.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Marriage forms — polyandry, polygyny, monogamy.

An example of a polyandrous society is the Andheri. (Film material available from the Open University, course D 100).

Lucy Mair's book 'Marriage' provides a discussion of societies where formal marriage is not common at all.

Kinship — patrilineal and matrilineal societies.

The Ashanti provide an example of matrilineal society, where the guardian of the children is the mother's brother.

The Navajo Indians — an example of a matrilocal society.

Functions

Looking at primary and secondary functions of the family should now be more meaningful using cross-cultural and historical material.

Varied patterns within our own society

Introduced through 'The Family of Man: Children.' B.B.C. Enterprises.
Back-up material:

Patterns of Infant care. J. and E. Newsom.
Studies in British Society. J. Banks.
Two studies of Kinship in London. R. Firth.
Family and Kinship in East London. P. Wilmot and M. Young.

Historical material:

The Family and Marriage in Britain. R. Fletcher.

Novels—The World We've Lost. P. Laslett.
Weekend in Dinlock. C. Segal.

Some people might wish to compare another industrial society with our own. Useful material for this is Ronald Dore's book on Japan.

Points about role relationships within the family, e.g. care of the elderly, must be gleaned from the material already introduced.

General Reference Material

Humanities Curriculum Project. Schools Council.
York General Studies Project. O.U.P.
Open University.
'The Family of Man' series. B.B.C. Enterprises.
St. Annes. Concord Films Council.
Seven-up. Concord Films Council.
Seven plus Seven. Concord Films Council.

We felt cross-cultural material to be a good introduction to the section on 'Order and Control,' which everyone in the group had found difficult to teach. It was felt that the best way to introduce a discussion of social control might be to bombard the students with information on the variety of norms within different societies, as well as within our own. Some examples are:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Different societies. Infanticide, senilicide — Aborigines, Eskimos.
Ritual murder — Feuding systems. (For information on the feuding systems among the Nuer, see 'Custom and Conflict in Africa' ch. 1 The Peace in the Feud. M. Gluckman)
War.
Capital punishment.

Historical comparisons within our own society

Attitudes to suicide, illegitimacy and divorce make interesting areas of comparison and local libraries may have old newspapers as source material.

N.B. the example of attitudes to homosexuality was raised, but the point was made that in a school situation, the teacher might find himself herself on the receiving end of some social control !

For material on the variety of attitudes within present day society a good example is different attitudes to socialisation which can be found in two films from Concord Films — 'Seven Up' and 'Seven Plus Seven.' 'The Block' from B.B.C. Enterprises could serve to raise discussion on the range of attitudes to homelessness.

On the various forms of control such as custom, convention, law, religion and beliefs, we have already had sufficient material about the variety of custom to draw upon, e.g. 'The Family of Man' series. Several of the group expressed the difficulty of dealing with religion, and one suggestion was to look at the social functions of religion among immigrant groups in this country. ('Race and Conflict in an Urban Community' — Rex and Moore).

APPENDIX ON COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGY

Suggestions for an O/A level syllabus were submitted by Professor Jean La Fontaine (L.S.E.) who was a member of a working party planning a comparative syllabus.

The aim would be to show how the social anthropologist works with material. The syllabus would comprise a number of units or modules which were self contained and could be put together in a number of ways. There would be a variety of modules from which the student could choose. Examples:

Death. Beliefs; attitudes towards; thought and actions; explanations; funerals; anecdotes. A study of the nature of death leads to a study of the nature of life.

Learning. What is learned (moving away from education and emphasising socialisation) process; knowledge and status; exclusion from knowledge, etc.

Graham Stewart
Daphne Such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SEX EDUCATION

The group who met to discuss anthropology and sex education were divided very fundamentally, not merely in their conception of the usefulness of anthropology, but also in their idea of sex education itself. They were agreed that sex education should include discussion of personal relationships as an essential part of the subject, as well as knowledge about human reproduction, sexual activity and contraception. From here onwards, there was a basic division between those who felt that anthropology was a useful tool for understanding human relationships, and those who thought it was too remote from children's everyday life to have any relevance for them. In particular, the division tended to follow the line between those who felt that it was important to know about alternative kinds of domestic groups and close relationships as well as the historical development of our family grouping and to discuss its 'fit' with present day people's needs, and those who did not think perspectives of this kind would be valuable to young people. This basic difference in view-point was not resolved in the course of the discussion — it would have been very surprising if it had been — but it was decided that it would be sensible to accept the schism, and for those who thought anthropology would be useful to discuss how it could be used, and what kinds of anthropological material might be used.

The first aspect they thought might be discussed was culturally different attitudes to sex roles, and in particular, more or less differentiation in the roles of men and women. There was a suggestion that films and slides (e.g. of the Hadza and Meao material) might be helpful in showing the division of labour and responsibilities between them. Adolescence, puberty and betrothal rites would be interesting foci of study. Age at marriage could also be discussed to highlight the different contexts of work and family-life, and the sort of opportunities and restrictions of present-day life in Britain.

Two other aspects of anthropological interest were discussed as thorny problems: the first was other people's theories of conception. It was decided that alternative theories might confuse children, and that there was a risk of giving the impression that other societies were 'savages' or 'backward,' when their theories did not satisfy our scientific criteria. The second aspect was moral relativism. The majority of the group thought it would be helpful to show different cultural attitudes to sexuality, chastity and pre-marital affairs in their socio-economic context, but they thought it would also be difficult, as there would be demands on the teacher to take up a moral position. Historical perspectives of our own culture, as reflected, for example, in the double standard of nineteenth century divorce laws, could be valuable material (or some thought so), but the teacher might well be harrassed by opposition from parents on questions such as these.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A further question, about which there was much more agreement, was that of population control. It was suggested that whether to get married at all might be posed as a reasonable question, and the advantages and disadvantages of having children could be discussed. Child-rearing itself was another topic which would lend itself to interesting cross-cultural comparisons, using the material selectively. The overall emphasis would be, for example, on the giving of security, and how it could be shared among wider groups than the nuclear family, e.g. neighbourhood groups, nursery groups and other larger and more permanent groups, such as communes.

Anthropology, it was thought, could be useful to those teachers who wanted to show that social relationships and feelings about relationships as we experience them are related to a specific social structure and the economic system upon which we depend. Where other ways of behaving, thinking and feeling were to be described, they should be talked about as other coherent systems and not as behavioural oddities. In this way anthropology could enrich one's understanding of everyday life, and help one to choose courses of action with a greater awareness of the needs people have, one's own responsibilities and the effects of those actions upon others.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE TEACHING RESOURCES PROJECT OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

In June 1972 a letter appeared in the **Times Educational Supplement** from the Secretary of the Royal Anthropological Institute announcing plans for a teaching aids unit and asking teachers who were interested to contact the Institute. This letter, and the follow-up which was published a few months later, was an exploratory measure to ascertain the extent of teacher interest in a non-school subject such as anthropology.

For some time the RAI had been receiving an increasing number of requests from teachers for materials to help them in presenting courses in humanities, liberal studies, social studies and other subjects. Anthropology had not previously been recognised as a school subject, and is still not examined for the General Certificate of Education, yet it appeared that teachers **were** introducing anthropological perspectives into their courses and museums and libraries reported that they were receiving more and more requests for anthropological material. It was evident that something ought to be done; and the RAI Teaching Resources Project began to take shape.

We decided that it would be sensible to begin by collating all the information which is at present available and this would enable us to produce a source book which would serve as a guide to the progress that is being made in the teaching of Anthropology outside the universities. The source book has been produced in the form of a folder which consists of sets of loose sheets, each set of sheets covering a separate topic. This folder, entitled "Guide to Resource Materials," is available from the RAI at a cost of 95p (including U.K. Postage and Packing). It will be renewed every three years, and kept up to date, free of charge, during each three-year period.

The folder contains amongst other things general information about the RAI and the services offered by the Institute, details of the progress of the Teaching Resources Project and of the teaching aids which have so far been developed and which will shortly be for sale, and information about our plans for the future. There is an annotated list of the films available for hire through the RAI film lending library and details of other libraries which possess anthropological films. We include a list of those universities in the United Kingdom with departments of anthropology, many members of which have, in reply to our request for their help, indicated their willingness to give talks to schools or to help teachers to prepare courses. As a result of our letters in the **Times Educational Supplement,** many people wrote to us and agreed to complete a questionnaire giving details of the sort of teaching they were doing and this has enabled us to compile a list of non-university teachers of anthropology. There is a section on examining in anthropology: the examining boards for the General Certificate of Education, Certificate of Secondary Education and the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

International Baccalaureate supplied, in many cases detailed, information about syllabus developments in the field of anthropology and this information is summarised in the folder together with a list of those schools in which anthropology is taught, either 'straight' for an examination syllabus, or as part of social studies, human biology, or humanities courses. We wrote to museums all over the country to ascertain the type of facilities they have available and whether or not they are willing to help schools; there is a section on the scope of the museum's ethnographic collections, and the educational services they offer. We include some general information on such things as resources centres and projects such as those run by the Schools Council, MACOS, and others which include anthropological subject matter. Finally, we have compiled an annotated bibliography, divided into sections: general introductions to anthropology ranging from the simplest we could find to first year university text books; monographs including some of the classics of the great anthropologists; family, kinship and marriage; magic, religion and ritual; social change; politics and economics; physical anthropology and archaeology; teaching anthropology (about which very little has been written in this country*); and novels and background reading, including such things as the diaries of fieldworkers, accounts written by anthropologists about their fieldwork experiences and novels written by non anthropologists but giving useful background information which can be used in teaching. We have tried to indicate the level at which the books can be used, and to point out defects where these exist (it is not, we feel, necessarily bad pedagogy to use a bad book in teaching, so long as both pupil and teacher are aware of the defects). We have also listed the RAI Occasional Papers and there is a complete bibliography of information on the Bushmen of the Kalahari, prepared by Margaret Nandy of the Blaby Teachers' Centre, Leicestershire, who has kindly allowed us to reproduce the results of a great deal of hard work on her part.

The Resources Folder is only the first step in the RAI's plans for a teaching aids unit, and our enquiries for information for the Folder have enabled us to identify some of the most pressing needs of teachers. There is a desperate need for books at a suitable level — books which neither talk down to pupils, nor are too academic. There is a desperate shortage of pictorial material — slides, filmstrips, and tapes and teachers' notes to accompany them. There is also a demand for speakers — for anthropologists to visit schools and talk about the work they are doing. Many teachers have specifically asked for materials for less able pupils. Others have made suggestions: for example that films should be made available dealing with, inter alia, teenage problems and the relevant cross cultural studies; that videotapes could be made of discussions amongst leading anthropologists; that a series of cheap, attractive, clear leaflets on specific topics might be produced with references to easily obtainable

*The RAI is planning an Occasional Paper dealing with this subject.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

books; and many teachers have requested a series of folders on themes or tribes, including artifacts, slides, tapes, photographs, translations of poetry, myths and so on.

Well — what are we doing to meet some of these needs? We are starting by keeping the folder up to date. At present the folder is in no way a comprehensive document. We have not done, and we do not claim to have done, the exhaustive research which is necessary to produce something comprehensive; this document has been compiled by a small group of people, working in their spare time and reyling heavily upon the co-operation of teachers, librarians, museum keepers and other interested individuals. The RAI has provided us with endless encouragement and professional advice, and has, of course, undertaken to scrutinise and print the contents of the folder, but we have had no financial support for our work other than that provided by the RAI. We need help. There are of necessity gaps in our information and we ask for those who find such gaps to help us fill them; ideally we need the assistance of a group of people each of whom would be responsible for the up-dating and re-researching of the information contained in each of the sections of the folder.

One of the most pressing problems is a need for books: the RAI has a contract with Penguins for a ten-volume series of paperbacks in social anthropology — these books are not textbooks but are aiming at a non-specialist audience and will use material selected to demonstrate the nature of the conclusions anthropologists draw and their approach to social life. In addition, we have already started a survey of children's books, and hope to add to the bibliography an annotated list of such books which may be used in anthropological teaching. We plan, too, an RAI Occasional Paper on the Teaching of Anthropology: a series of articles by those teaching at a variety of levels.

With regard to the need for speakers, and for anthropologists to visit schools and talk about their experiences; we have already contacted all the university departments of anthropology in this country, and have received from many members of those departments offers to give such talks and to help teachers prepare courses.

On the visual aids side, we are fortunate to have been offered help by Richard Thorn, a lecturer at Bristol Polytechnic, who is in charge of the learning resources centre there. Richard is able to involve his students in designing suitable visual aids as part of their Dip.A.D. Project work, and these materials are shortly to be available for sale through RAI.* At present we have available a series of tape/slide packs, some overhead projector transparencies, sets of slides on various topics and a Monopoly-type game on the Bristol slave trade. Many of these have been prepared at the request of individual teachers, and it is hoped to work on some of the suggestions which have been put forward, both at the ATSS Conference at Easter this year, and through many other contacts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Finally a Bristol group are working on the Mermaid Project. This is a presentation at the Mermaid Theatre Molecule Club of a musical show designed, as are all Molecule Club productions, to show 7-12 year-olds that science and its applications are part and parcel of everyday life and not merely laboratory exercise. The RAI production is to be entitled "Man — the Communicator" and is based on a story about a man from Mars who arrives upon this planet, who needs to communicate with us, and who has some questions to ask about our world.

These are some of the things we are doing at present.** What of our plans for the future? RAI Committees such as the film selection committee, are kept in touch with the sort of things teachers are asking for and are doing their best to bear these demands in mind. We would very much like to start work on a series of folders on the lines of Jackdaws, but this involves a lot of work, and we are already using up most of our spare time; we need an anthropologist to help us design folders, decide upon the contents, and find a publisher. We would like to take up the suggestion that we should produce a series of brief and concise leaflets on certain topics or themes. Again, we need help.

Probably the greatest single need felt by teachers is for contact with others who are teaching anthropology in schools. We already have a group working on visual aids in Bristol, and the co-operation both of a teachers' centre in London and of the regional groups already existing through the ATSS; these are only some of the many possible regional centres throughout the UK where we might set up local groups of teachers with a common interest to exchange ideas about curricula, keep up to date in the field and generate and produce teaching aids. The ATSS conference was perhaps instrumental in enabling us to identify the greatest problem: we were bombarded with resources from every possible direction and shown just how much is available, if one knows where to look, but very little was said about **how** we should use these materials. It seems essential to try and set up a series of "workshops," lasting a weekend, or possibly longer, for which teachers can prepare in advance and at which teaching methods can be demonstrated and discussed. The RAI and the ATSS are jointly trying to develop this sort of follow-up to the conference.

These, then, are some of the attempts which are being made to help teachers develop anthropology in the classroom. This is only a beginning. Anyone who can help in any way would be welcomed as a member of our team; even a small note on a post-card pointing out an error or suggesting a suitable addition to the bibliography is a valuable supplement to our growing fund of information. We are aware that we have as yet only covered the ground thinly but we

* We hope to prepare a catalogue by December, 1973
**For further details of all these plans, see Resources Folder.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

hope that, by the time the second issue of the Resources Folder is presented in three years' time, there will have been substantial additions to the present version and that some of our plans for the future will have taken shape.

ANN HURMAN, Project Director.

JEAN LA FONTAINE, R.A.I. Publications Officer.

ANN RENDER, Project Assistant.

RICHARD THORN, Technical Adviser.

JAMES WOODBURN, R.A.I. Film Lending Library.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The opinions expressed in this journal are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Association.

The Association exists to provide a medium for the expression of views about social science and social studies teaching. The editor welcomes correspondence and papers on any matter of interest to social science teachers, at all levels, as well as those matters stemming from this issue.

They should be sent to:

Charles Townley, A.T.S.S. Publications Editor,
" Gateacre,"
Brook Lane,
Charnock Richard,
Chorley,
Lancs. PR7 5LJ.